

BY

ROBERT L. DABNEY, D. D., LL. D.

RECENTLY PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY  
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AND FOR  
MANY YEARS PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY  
IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
IN VIRGINIA.

EDITED BY

C. R. VAUGHAN, D. D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, VIRGINIA.

VOL. IV.  
SECULAR.

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
THE NEW SOUTH,	1
LETTER TO O. O. HOWARD, CHIEF OF FREEDMEN'S BUREAU,	25
ABSTRACTIONISTS,	46
CRIMES OF PHILANTHROPY,	53
DEFENSE OF DR. DABNEY'S NARRATIVE OF THE FIRST BATTLE OF MANASSAS,	71
NARRATIVE OF COL. J. B. BALDWIN, of his Secret Interview with Abraham Lincoln in 1861, Disclosing the Origin of the War,	87
THE REAL CAUSE OF THE WAR,	101
THE DUTY OF THE HOUR,	108
THE UNITED STATES AS A MILITARY NATION,	123
STONEWALL JACKSON, Lecture,	149
THE NEGRO AND THE COMMON SCHOOL,	176
THE STATE FREE SCHOOL SYSTEM Imposed upon Virginia by the Underwood Constitution,	191
SECULARIZED EDUCATION,	225
REVIEW OF "WILSON'S SLAVE POWER IN AMERICA,"	248
STATE FREE SCHOOLS,	260
COMMENDATION OF THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY, Lecture,	281
LABOR UNIONS, THE STRIKE AND THE COMMUNE,	294
DEPRESSION OF AMERICAN FARMING INTERESTS,	321
THE DOLLAR OF THE DADDIES.	341
ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE FORMER LABOR SYSTEM OF THE SOUTH- ERN UNITED STATES,	354
MEMOIRS OF FRANCIS S. SAMPSON, D. D.,	392
TRUE COURAGE. A Memorial Sermon on the Death of General T. J. Jackson, June, 1863,	435
A MEMORIAL OF LIEUT. COL. JOHN T. THORNTON of the Third Virginia Cavalry, C. S. A.,	453
NATURE CANNOT REVOLUTIONIZE NATURE,	470
SAMUEL C. ANDERSON, OF PRINCE EDWARD,	476
WOMEN'S RIGHTS WOMEN,	489
LATEST INFIDELITY. A Reply to Ingersoll's Position,	506
THE ATTRACTIONS OF POPERY,	540
THE INFLUENCE OF FALSE PHILOSOPHIES UPON CHARACTER AND AND CONDUCT,	568
SAN MARCUS RIVER,	577
DEATH OF MOSES,	579
BAPTISMAL HYMN. A Monody. The Dying Christian,	584
A SONNET TO LEE,	587
GEN'L T. J. JACKSON. An Elegy,	588
ANNIHILATION.	594
FIRST TEXAS BRIGADE AT THE WILDERNESS,	598

## THE NEW SOUTH.

A Discourse delivered at the Annual Commencement of Hampden Sidney College, June 15, 1882, before the Philanthropic and Union Literary Societies.

Young Gentlemen of the Philanthropic and Union Societies,  
And Ladies and Gentlemen of the Audience:

You will credit my expression of sincere embarrassment at this time when you consider that I am attempting a species of discourse somewhat unwonted to a preacher of the Gospel, and yet more, that I am placed here only as a species of *Dernier Resort*. We all had hopes that another gentleman would represent the two Literary Societies, better fitted to entertain and instruct this assemblage. But disappointment left the place, at a very late period, unfilled, and we were threatened with having this important part of our literary anniversary left a mere blank. I stand here, therefore, in the *formula* of your exercises very much in the place of that "infinitesimal quantity," which the algebraist places equal to zero in his equation, without appreciable error.

This fact might have led me to decline the untimely effort, but we who are passing off the stage of public action owe a sympathy to the young who are entering on it, which should forbid our withholding any service or evidence of affection they may ask of us. It is this which has forbidden my saying No to your request.

In your case there is another weighty consideration which ought to reinforce your claim on us for a deep sympathy. This is found in the momentous difficulties of the Arena on which the young men of the coming generation are called to act their part. And yet another thought crosses the mind. Ought the knowledge of the difficulties which are before you to stimulate the expression of our interest, or ought it to dictate a modesty, which should silence us as advisers of our young countrymen? For it is by our hands that these cruel conditions of your life-problem have been transmitted to you. The heritage of freedom

which our fathers left us, we have not been able to bequeath to you. As memory reverts to my youth, when I stood where you now stand, it presents a contrast which might well seal my lips with grief and shame. Then my honored father and grandfather were just going off the stage, the one a soldier of the first war which won our independence, and the other of the second war which confirmed it, both examples of that citizen soldiery which had been the glory of America, plain, simple, unpretending, but incorruptible. And Virginia then stood, with untarnished escutcheon, poor indeed from the burdens of two wars, and the legislative exactions of her partners in the Union, clad mostly in homespun, but still the "great and unterrified commonwealth" which extorted this tribute from Cornwallis in his hour of victory: "mother of Statesmen and States," whose humblest citizen knew no master except God and the law of his own State's election, whose banner had never trailed before a conqueror, by whom no federal obligation had ever been dishonored, and no creditor ever defrauded of one penny; with a credit as solid as gold in the *emporiums* of trade; the firm and prudent mediator between federal power and the too impatient spirit of her sisters. Thus did our fathers transmit Virginia to our guardianship, the warrior-virgin, like the Pallas-Athene of Phidias, as she stood before the Parthenon, flashing the radiance of her golden helm and full-orbed shield across the Saronic gulf and Aegina and Salamis, to far off Maegara and Argos.

But we, *vae nobis miserrimis!* deliver her over to you, not. How? a pallid, woful widow, deflowered by subjugation, dismembered of her fair proportions, her weeds besmirched even by her own sons, virtually governed by the votes of an alien and barbarous horde, forced into her bosom by her late partners, now her ravagers, against her constant protest!

As I remember this I ask myself, should not men who have so failed in their charge, who have suffered the glorious heritage of their fathers to be so marred in their hands, cover their faces and be silent?

But our sons, whom our weakness, or else our hard fate, has left disinherited, seem not to be ashamed of us! They ask, they encourage us to speak. This is my apology for presuming to speak to-day to the "New South," and of the New South.



Our other apology is, that in the endeavor to save the liberties transmitted by our fathers, we did what we could. And in proof of this justifying plea, we can point to the forms prematurely bent, and the heads whitened by fatigue and camp diseases, to the empty sleeves, and wooden legs, and to the Confederate graves so thickly strewn over the land. Our apology is, again, that while we were contending for the rights and interests of the civilized world, nearly the whole world blindly and passionately arrayed itself against us. Such was the strange permission of Providence, that we, while defending the cause of all, should be slandered and misunderstood by all. But why should I say this fearful dispensation was strange? when we see that from the days of the Christian martyrs until now, mankind have usually resisted and sought to destroy its true benefactors. So it was; we had the world against us. There was, after all, little exaggeration in the description which the Confederate soldier at Missionary Ridge, with the humorous exaggeration of his class, gave of his own case. Said he: No misgiving of our final delivery had ever disturbed him until at the early dawn of that disastrous battle, as he was standing post on the advanced picket on Lookout Mountain, just when the stars were beginning to pale before the grey dawn, and all nature stood hushed in expectancy of the coming king of day, the solemn silence was broken by the words of command, rolling from the Yankee headquarters over the forests in these terms: "Attention, World! Nations, by the right flank, forward! Wheel into line of battle." Yes, we had the world against us.

And this is one item of proof for that fact which completes our apology for failure; that subsequent events have shown we were attempting to defend and preserve a system of free government which had become impossible by reason of the change and degeneration of the age. We did not believe this at the time, for we had not omniscience. Nay, it was, at that time, our duty not to know it, or to believe it, even as it is the duty of the loyal son not to believe the disease of his venerable mother mortal, so long as hope is possible; not to cease the efforts of his love, and not to surrender her to death while love and tenderness can contest the prize. We had received this free government from our fathers, baptized in their blood; we

had received from them the sacred injunction to preserve it. We had witnessed its beneficent results. Of all men it was our duty to feel ourselves most bound by the maxim of the Roman republican, *Non fas est de Republica desperare*. The changes had silently taken place, which rendered our fathers' system too good for those who were to execute it; and yet it would have been treason to truth and right for us to despair of the better possibility, until the impossibility stood sternly revealed. Thus the task which duty and Providence assigned us was, to demonstrate by our own defeat, after intensest struggle, the unfitness of the age for that blessing we would fain have preserved for them. Hard task, and hard destiny to attempt the impossible! but one which has often been exacted by a mysterious Providence from the votaries of duty. Yet it gives us this hard consolation, that inasmuch as the survival of our old system had become impracticable, failure in the effort to preserve it might be incurred without dishonor.

And there is this concurrence in the justification of the Confederates, and the justification to which you, the "New South," will soon have to appeal for your actions: that both apologies are correctly drawn from the same premise. Because the old free system has become impossible for your times; therefore you will be justified in living and acting under an opposite one. There will be an apparent paradox in this: that you shall applaud and revere your fathers for their determined opposition to forms and principles, which you shall receive and even sustain. But the paradox will be only in seeming. Your justification will be found where we find ours; in the fact that the institutions which it was our duty to defend, because they still existed, it will be your duty to surrender, because you have learned by our innocent calamity that they cannot hereafter exist. "A new South" is inevitable, and therefore it will be right for you to accept it, though it was our duty to fight to prevent it. It may be the son's duty to-morrow to "bury the dead mother out of his sight," whom it was the father's most sacred duty yesterday to endeavor to keep alive.

The government our fathers left to us was a federation of sovereign States. As such they emerged from the war of the revolution, and were recognized by Great Britain. As such

they met in convention to devise a "closer union." As such they debated and accepted or rejected the terms proposed therefor (for some States at first did exercise their unquestioned sovereignty in rejecting the new union.) By their several and sovereign acts they created a central federated government, with limited powers strictly defined, and deputed to this common-agent certain powers over their own citizens, to be impartially exercised for the equal behoof of all the partners. All other powers, including that of judging and redressing vital infractions of this federal compact, they jealously and expressly reserved to themselves or to their people. To the outside world they were to be one, to each other they were to be still equals and independent partners. Each State must be a republic, as distinguished from a monarchy or oligarchy, but in all else it was to be mistress of its own internal forms and regulations. The functions of the general government were to be few and defined, its expenditures modest, and its burdens in time of peace light. Such was the form of government instituted for themselves by our free forefathers; and well fitted to their genius and circumstances, as communities of farmers, inhabiting their own homes, approaching an equality of condition, and having upon the whole continent no one city of controlling magnitude or wealth.

But this century has seen all this reversed; and conditions of human society have grown up, which make the system of our free forefathers obviously impracticable in the future. And this is so, not because the old forms were not good enough for this day, but because they were too good for it.

1. I would place as the first of these adverse conditions the silent substitution, under the same nomenclature, of another theory of human rights, in contrast with, and hostile to, that of our fathers. Those wise men did indeed believe in a certain *equality* of all men; but it was that which the British constitution (whose principles they inherited) was wont to express by the maxim: that every British citizen "was equal before the law." The particular franchises of the peer and the peasant were very unequal, but in this important respect the two men were "equal before the law," that the peasant's smaller franchises were protected by the same law which shielded the peer's

larger one. This is the equality of the golden rule, the equality of that Bible which ordained the constitution of human society out of superiors, inferiors and equals; the equality of the inspired Job (ch. 31: 13-15) who in the very act of asserting his right to his slave, added: "Did not he that made me make him? If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or my maid-servant when they contended with me, what then shall I do when God riseth up?" This is the equality which is thoroughly consistent with that wide diversity of natural capacities, virtues, station, sex, inherited possessions, which inexorable fact discloses everywhere and by means of which social organization is possible. But in place of this, the equality taught by Hampden, Vane, Pym, Melville, and the Whigs of 1776, our modern politician now teaches, under the same name, the equality of the Jacobin, of the "Sans culotte," which absurdly claims for every human the same specific powers and rights. Yes, your Greeley teaches, as the equality of Republicanism, the very doctrine of the frantic Leveller Lilburn, whose book these great English Republicans caused (not your tyrannical Stuart but the commonwealth's-men) to be burned in London by the common hangman!

Our fathers valued liberty, but the liberty for which they contended was each person's privilege to do those things and those only to which God's law and Providence gave him a moral right. The liberty of nature which your modern asserts is absolute license; the privilege of doing whatever a corrupt will craves, except as this license is curbed by a voluntary "social contract." The fathers of our country could have adopted the sublime words of Melville: *Lex: Rex. The Law is king.* Or have said with Sir Wm. Jones:

*Men* constitute a State:  
And sovereign *Law*, that State's collected will,  
O'er thrones and globes elate,  
Sits Empress, crowning good, repressing ill.  
Smit by her sacred frown,  
The fiend (Construction) *Discretion* like a vapor sinks,  
And even the all-dazzling crown,  
Hides his faint rays, and at her bidding shrinks.

But now, by this new Republicanism, the supreme law is

the will or caprice of what happens to be *the major mob*, the suggestion of the demagogue who is most artful to seduce.

These are a few items of the new creed, which has stolen the nomenclature of the old. Since it is a theory at all essential points antagonistic to the old, its prevalence cannot but supplant those sound institutions which were the natural outgrowth of the orthodox doctrine.

2. When our former constitution was adopted, America contained no metropolis, not even any city of note; there were a few trading towns, of which each State had one or more, and of which neither had any effectual ascendancy over the others. Hence State equality was practicable, and could be effectively something more than a name. But now, the great *emporium* of this continent has made herself, by virtue of natural advantages co-operating with partial legislation, commercial mistress of all, and asserts a financial ascendancy which brings the business and the welfare of the whole country to her feet. It used to be said that in England "all roads lead to London." So, in this vast continent, all railroads tend to New York, or those which vainly attempt to reject her dominion soon feel it in the form of empty trains and vanished revenues. Now, in view of that truth announced by Solomon, that "money answereth all things," can a sensible man persuade himself that political independence and equality can permanently remain in a land where financial despotism has become established? "The borrower is servant to the lender." The political subjection must, sooner or later, follow the financial.

3. Our century has witnessed a general change of social conditions by means of the marvelous applications of science and mechanic art to cheapen transportation and production. Once the commonwealth owned all the highways by water and by land, and each private citizen might become a carrier if he chose. Now the highways are the property of great carrying corporations, who command more men as their disciplined *employes* than the government's own standing army, before whose revenues the whole incomes of commonwealths are paltry trifles; to whose will legislatures hasten to bow. Each of these roads points virtually to New York. To that city, yes, to one corner of Wall Street in that city, center all their debts, their loans, their revenues, their chief management.

This centralization is as remarkable also in the producing arts. The time was when manufactures were literally domestic—the occupations of the people *in their homes*. The industrious producing citizen was a “free-bolder,” a name whose vital significance to British liberty our times have almost forgotten. He dwelt under his own roof-tree. He was his own man; he was the fee-simple owner of the homestead where his productions were created by the skill and labor of himself and his children, apprentices and servants. Now all this is changed; the loom is no longer heard in the home; vast factories, owned by monopolists for whom the cant of the age has already found their appropriate name as “kings of industry,” now undersell the home products everywhere. The axe and hoe which the husbandman wields, once made at the country forge, the shoe placed on his mule’s feet, the plow with which he turns the soil, the very belve in his tool, all come from the factory. The home industry of the housewife in brewing her own yeast can hardly survive, but is supplanted by your factory “baking powders,” in which chemical adulterations may have full play. Thus production is centralized. Capital is collected in commanding masses, at whose bidding the free-holding citizen is sunk into the multitudinous hiring proletariat. Conditions of social organization are again produced, fully parallel to the worst results of feudalism, in their incompatibility with republican institutions.

4. From these changes have resulted the extreme inequalities of fortune, expenditures and luxury which now deform American society. When our late constitution was enacted, American citizens enjoyed a general equality of fortune and comfort, which made a real, republican equality of rights practicable. The only aristocracy recognized was that of intelligence and merit. The richest citizen was only a farmer, somewhat more abounding than his neighbor, in the breadth of his fields. A British writer, endeavoring to trace in the republican society the existence of a gentry, could find no greater incomes than those of Washington, of Mt. Vernon, and Carroll, of Carrollton, each reaching possibly \$20,000 per annum. And the Mt. Vernon mansion appeared in his eyes so modest that he spoke of it as “the cottage,” inhabited by the proprietor. But

now! some of our "kings of industry" count their incomes by almost as many dollars per day. Set the more than regal luxury of a Vanderbilt, in his gaudy palace, beside the hireling laborer in his sordid tenement-lodging, who is his theoretical EQUAL! Yes, the starving hireling's vote, who does not know whence to-morrow's potatoes are to come for the pauper dinner of his ragged children, shall count for precisely as much as the vote of a Vanderbilt. This is the theory. And this wretch is so exalted by his manhood suffrage, is he? as to be thoroughly content with the monstrous inequality of enjoyments and to hearken to no cravings of envy or rancour, when he sees this rampant luxury flaunted before his misery? And this lordly millionaire, pampered by his immeasurable abundance, will feel no lust of power, no ambition to add civic dominion to the plutocratic which he already possesses, and he will be satisfied to have the ignorant vote of his hireling weigh precisely as much as his own in every legislative act touching his tenure of his millions? He who knows human nature sees that to expect this is mere craziness. This enormous inequality in wealth will seek to protect, to assert itself in politics. But our new-fangled Republicanism asserts that, politically, the Vanderbilt shall be the precise equivalent of the pauper. It leaves the rich man no legitimate form for the assertion of his superior weight or the protection of his superior interests in the State. Wealth, then, must seek for itself illegitimate forms. And in obeying the inevitable impulse through these illegal ways, it must corrupt itself, and the institutions of the land.

5. The press has been looked to as the safe guardian of popular institutions. It has been called by an English Whig "the fourth estate of the Realm." But the influences under which the political press in America operates constitute this also one of the fatal hindrances to the subsistence of wise, free institutions. The powerful journals must be also the creatures of money. The conditions of journalism are such that only a vast capital can float a journal into a safe and permanent haven of success. Literature is a commodity, money buys and sells it. Let the genius of an Addison, a Bolingbrooke, a Junius, a Macaulay, all be combined on the one side, with all the richest

resources of historical learning to publish the political truths which happen to be unpopular without a great capital; and let commercial capital give its support to the pen of the most ignorant demagogue to propagate the crudest absurdities in which capital supposes it has a selfish and corrupt interest, you shall see the wisdom of true statesmanship, embellished by all the graces of scholarship consigned to an unread obscurity in this country, while the vulgar stupidities of error shall visit every table and claim every eye. Mammon wills it so, and Mammon rules.

The reason is because the leading presses of the commercial centers are either the tools of parties and used for exclusive partisan purposes, or else they are, like the calico mills, mere joint-stock concerns for money making. Either way, the result is the same. The contents of the journal are not dictated at all by truth or right, but solely by self-interest. What doctrine shall it assert? Only that which advances the strength of the faction, or which attracts the more numerous subscribers. Thus the press instead of being the guide, becomes the mere sycophant of misguided public opinion. Let only any political heresy begin to be current enough to become an element of danger to sound institutions, and thenceforward it is the interest and business of the great journals to give it their support. To resist and explode it "would not pay."

6. One more change only, my time permits me to state, which concurs to render the system of our fathers a thing of the past. This is the invariable extension of the suffrage, which has attended every political change in America. This trait has characterized not only the violent revolution through which we have passed, but every modification of constitution made by the States. We even see it working with equal certainty in the reform measures of once conservative England. In every case where a State constitution has been opened to change, that change has been towards universal suffrage, unless this extreme had been already reached; and in no single case has a restriction of suffrage been even attempted. There is a reason for this fated law of progress downwards in the nature of the demagogue, and it may be said in passing, that this presents us the fatal weak point in the theory of popular government.



The selfish calculations and instincts of these courtiers of King Mob, always prompt them to advocate every extension, no matter how unwise or destructive, and seal their lips from opposing it. Their calculation runs thus: Here is a new class whom some one has proposed to enfranchise. I know, as does every sensible man, that it is a folly. But perhaps the proposal may prevail. Hence, I cannot afford to oppose it, for should it prevail, the newly enfranchised, when they come to the polls, will remember my action against me. But if I am a forward advocate of it, their gratitude will make them vote for me. Thus the craziest and most ruinous proposition to create a new class of voters, always has zealous assertors, and for the same reason it meets with no opposers who are effective.

Such were the avowed motives (with sectional hatred and revenge) which prompted our conquerors to fix on the Southern half of the country that last extreme of political madness, the universal and unqualified suffrage of the slaves. And how deadly in their potency these motives of self-seeking are, we may see in this fact, that they even silence the protest of our own politicians! There is not one of them who does not know that this measure is inevitably pregnant with the corruption and overthrow of honest, popular government; yet there is not one of them, who is a candidate for votes, who has the nerve to say what he thinks, or to demand a reversal of the criminal blunder. But when the leaders of the very people who are the first victims of this wrong, are too much intimidated to lift a finger for its correction, whence shall deliverance from, the fatal incubus come? There will be no deliverance until suffrage shall have been so foully corrupted by this and its other perversions, that a despairing and ruined people take refuge from its intolerable tyrannies in the will of an autocrat, and the ignorant and venal cease to vote only when and because all will be forbidden to vote.

Whether just and free institutions can co-exist in such a country as this, with its vast population and inequalities of condition, along with this extravagance of universal suffrage, needs no debate. Do you remember the prophetic letter of Lord Macaulay to Mr. Randall, of New York? Do you remember the homely instance by which a greater than Macaulay, and a more

prophetic statesman, was wont to close his arguments in favor of that sheet anchor of liberty, free-hold suffrage? Mr. Randolph used to exclaim: "Sirs, the empty sack does not stand upright." In an advanced material civilization like ours, every political action touches property somewhere. If the vote which represents no property is made of equal weight with the vote which represents large property, then, with such inequalities of wealth, with such ostentatious displays of the luxury of the few piquing the envy of the impoverished many, just so surely as men are men, greedy in desire, selfish and unrighteous, and the more unrighteous where their crime is wrapped up from the eye of conscience in the folds of associated action, two results must follow, are already following. The attempt of the proletariat and their demagogues to use their irresponsible suffrage for plunder; the resistance of the capital-holding minority to this plunder. But for this resistance, though it be as inevitable as the instincts of self-preservation, your radical theory offers no recognized, legitimate mode. Radicalism ordains that the small shall be equal to the large; the dependent shall counterweigh the independent; the vote which has nothing to lose, shall dispose of the vote of him who has all to lose. The result is, that self-defense invents illegitimate modes, and the unrighteous assault on property is met by the illegal use of property to protect itself and to inflate itself until the moral corruptions wrought in our politics fester to putrescence and dissolve the body.

As we thus look back upon the social revolution which had established itself in our century, we see that political revolution had become unavoidable. The assault on our rights and institutions was but the first wave of the cataclysm. It swept over our best resistance, because there were other waves behind it which are destined in turn to conquer our conquerors. He is a shallow man, indeed, who supposes that the revolution will pause at its present stage, leaving the conquering section ascendant, and rendering this unstable equilibrium of the moment permanent. No, we have now seen but the first act of the drama, and it has been a tragedy. The curtain has fallen for the time to the music of a *miserere*, whose jarring chords have fretted the heartstrings of such as Lee and his comrades into

death. It may well happen that after the fashion of the mimic stage, the next rise of the curtain may be accompanied by the garish lights of a deceitful joy, the blood stains of the recent tragedy covered with fresh saw dust, and the new actors ushered in with a burst of gay melody. But the other acts are to follow. May they not be tragic also?

That popular suffrage does not now really govern this country, that it is notoriously a marketable commodity, that the United States have really ceased already to be what they pretend, a federation of republican States, no clear sighted man doubts. Under a thin veil of radical democracy, the government has already become an oligarchy. Are not State conventions traded off by the magnates as openly as blocks of railroad bonds? Are not legislatures bought as really and almost as openly as cargoes of corn? Are not "corners" made in politics by which the weaker capitalists are sold out, as really as in the pork market? It is Washington or Wall Street which really dictates what platforms shall be set forth, and what candidates elected and what appointments made, not the people of the States. Some of you may have heard of the incident which happened in our neighboring town, in that year when our Southern conservatives, in their wisdom, made Horace Greeley their standard-bearer, hoping, it seems, like the superstitious Jews, to "cast out devils through Beelzebub, the chief of the devils"; to retrieve the cause of order and right through the arch incendiary and agitator of the country. Several hopeful souls were arguing his success from the many signs of his acceptance with the people. It was said, whole radical towns, whole Union Leagues in the northwest were coming over to Greeley. A sagacious banker standing by quietly shook his head. Our friends, almost vexed at his skepticism, asked: "Why? do not all these accessions, with the Southern support, promise him success?" His answer was: "Gentlemen, I do business in Wall Street, and Wall Street does not want Greeley." And so the country did not have Greeley, and Greeley did not have the presidency he coveted, but went aside to die of chagrin.

So Wall Street saw in the third term imperialism thinly masked, and as its oligarchs preferred to be masters themselves, rather than have Grant their master and ours, Wall

Street sent to Chicago and nominated Garfield as its convenient lay-figure. But having carried its main point it really cared very little about the choice between him and Hancock, and for a time did not trouble itself. So the people were about to elect Hancock. But one fine morning this simple minded "beefeater" perpetrated the *faux pas* of endorsing the greenback victory in Maine. And now that Wall Street saw that the Hancock regime was committed to "soft money," it did trouble itself, and woke up and put its hand to the canvass. It would none of Hancock and his soft money, and so the people could not have Hancock nor he have the presidency.

Obviously the government now ascendant in the country while "Republican" in name and ultra-democratic in theory, is an oligarchy in fact. Extremes often thus meet. Nothing can be more fallacious than that view, advanced by some of our conciliatory statesmen, which represents the recent revolutions as only a temporary excitement and partial fit of excess from which the institutions of the country will re-act under prudent management and regain their old constitutional status. There will be no re-action in that sense. The morbid causes which were so potent to overthrow will yet more certainly be powerful enough to resist and suppress the weak efforts of a crippled, prostrate constitution. The obstacles between us and a return to past precedents are too mountainous. Consider for instance, that "spoils system," now strong with a generation's growth. If it is to be perpetrated, this of itself makes popular constitutional government impossible. For every intelligent man sees that it converts office-holders from servants of the people to paid agents for circumventing the people's will at the polls, paid with the money of the people they help to enslave. This is the very signature of despotism, that the citizen's money is taken to bribe agents for suppressing the citizen's will. Under this system the office-holders are the pretorian cohorts of the usurper.

But let one think out now the conditions essential to the realizing of that "civil service reform," which each party pretends to promise, but which neither party purposes, as the appropriate remedy for the spoils system. One of the requisite conditions is that one of these parties upon ousting the other

from power shall exercise the self-denial and magnanimity to leave all their rival's appointees, except those expressly punishable for official malfeasance, undisturbed in their offices and salaries. For if the victorious party is to signalize its accession, won, we will suppose, on the promise of civil service reform, by expelling all the office-holders of the opposite and defeated party, this will not be to inaugurate the wholesome remedy, but only to repeat the abuse. And thus they would more than ever ensure at the next turn of the wheel of fortune that their reinstated rivals would imitate their vindictive example, turn out all their new appointees and again postpone the happy change. Let us suppose, for example, that the people should again elect a conservative President and that he should not, like poor Mr. Tilden, submit at the bidding of Wall Street to the robbery of himself and the people of America, but should be inaugurated; shall he magnanimously leave every appointee, though an agent or a tool of the present spoils system, undisturbed? Then there is no official reward for his supporters who have toiled for his election. They must have worked for naught but an idea, a prompting of pure patriotism. Whence is the money to come to wage the campaign when all will have been notified in advance that there will be no way for them to repay themselves out of the public crib? It is well known that a national campaign now costs as much as a military one, and that money is to it as essential as "the sinews of war." Does any party in America possess this lofty patriotism? Will either party thus work for nothing? But let us suppose that the incoming conservative shall make a pretext that the office-holders he finds in place have been there as "spoils-men," and turn them out to make room for his supporters; then the inevitable result is that the opposing party will denounce him as a traitor to his own civil service reform, and devote themselves to retaliation. Such are the obstacles which beset the abatement of this peril in America. "Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook, or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down? Canst thou put a hook into his nose?"

Such are the fatal influences which obstruct all return and ensure the progress of the revolution. There is a new era and hence there must be a "New South."

*What manner of thing shall it be?* To prognosticate or prophecy is not the proper part for us to play who fell with the old South. For us a more modest part is appropriate. We shall claim our prerogative forever of defending our own principles, which a decadent country has pronounced too elevated for it to tolerate, and of consulting our own self-respect. Justice to you requires that we shall leave you to guide your own destiny in that new and untried sea into which you are launching.

But there are some principles which we may safely inculcate on you, because whatever else may change these cannot change. The glory of our old independence and its history, the beneficence of the confederate principles of our old constitution, concurred to teach us an exalted, perhaps an overweening appreciation of the value of such political institutions. But we do not forget that other people have had other forms of government, aristocratic or regal, and under them have had their share of the domestic virtues, of patriotism, of civilization, of Christianity. (But under the illicit and dirty oligarchy of which our present regime is a virtual specimen, no people has ever had or can ever have anything but corruption, ignominy and vice.) Our best prayer for you is, that out of the present foul transition, a good Providence may cause some new order to arise tolerable for honest men. The changes implied in the introduction of this new order may be accepted by the old confederates as old age, as infirmity, or as a not distant death. They must be accepted by me as the inevitable. But the principles of truth and righteousness are as eternal as their divine legislator. These must be upheld under all dynasties and forms. Here, in one word, is the safe pole-star for the "New South"; let them adopt the scriptural politics, assured that they will ever be as true and just under any new regime as under the one that has passed away: "That righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." That "wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, and strength of salvation; the fear of the Lord is His treasure." That "he that walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and

shutteth his eyes from beholding evil; he shall dwell on high; his place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks."

Some of the applications of these unchanging principles are obvious to experience guided by truth. Permit me briefly to unfold three of these to you, which are shown to be timely and momentous by the special temptations to which a subjugated people are exposed while passing of necessity under a new and conquering system. One of these plausible temptations is to conclude that the surest way to retrieve your prosperity will be to **BECOME LIKE THE CONQUERORS**. This is an inference as false as it is specious; the fact that your fathers are conquered may ground a good inference perhaps, that you should seek to be in some respect **UNLIKE US**. May you be unlike us in being more fortunate! But a very brief observation of history will teach you that violent aggressors, in overthrowing their rivals, also usually prepare their own overthrow. Their calamities are only postponed to the second place. The Jacobins overthrew Louis XVI., but Bonaparte crushed the Jacobins, and Europe crushed Napoleon. Shall this be the best reparation for the miseries of the fall of the Confederacy; that you shall share, for a few deceitful days, the victors' gains of oppression, to be overwhelmed along with him in his approaching retribution? Be sure of one thing, "his curses will come home to roost." In order to escape the fearful reckoning, you must not only make yourselves unlike as but unlike them.

"The North triumphed by its wealth." Here is the temptation to the New South, to which I already see ominous symptoms of yielding, to make wealth the idol, the all in all of sectional greatness. I hear our young men quote to each other the advice of the wily diplomat Gorstchacoff, to the beaten French: "Be strong." They exclaim: Let us *develope! develope! develope!* Let us have, like our conquerors, great cities, great capitalists, great factories and commerce and great populations; then we shall cope with them.

Now here is a path which will require of you the nicest discrimination, and the most perspicacious virtue and self-denial. On the one hand it is indisputable that under our modern, material civilization, wealth is an essential element of national greatness. The commonwealth which presents a sparse and

impoverished population, in competition with a rich and populous rival, will come by the worse in spite of her martial virtues; and may make her account to be dependent and subordinate. Hence to develop the South is one of the plainest duties of patriotism. To increase its riches is one way to increase its power of self-protection. And a knowledge, and hardy, diligent practice of the industries of production are among the civic virtues which it behooves the New South to cultivate. So much is to be asserted on that side.

But on the other side the deduction that all our section has to do is to imitate the conquering section in that one of its qualities by which it got wealth; to make the appliances of production the all in all; to exclaim as so many do of factories, and mines, and banks, and stock boards, and horse-powers of steam, and patent machines, "These be thy gods, O Israel!" This would be a deadly mistake. Does not history teach that "wealth is the sinews of war?" yes, not seldom; but it teaches at least as often that wealth and material civilization have been the emasculators of nations and the incitements of their enemies at once, only ensuring the deeper destruction for the rich and cultivated people. Our own overthrow is near at hand to teach us this lesson, for we were the richer section subjugated by the poorer, which was shrewd enough to hie on the pauper proletarians of a hungry world upon our wealth as their prey. Do some of you exclaim: "What, the South the richer section?" Very likely many of you are already so indoctrinated in that tuition of lies, against which I shall have to caution you anon, that this will be news to you. Nevertheless is it true: the South was by one-quarter if not one-third, the richer section, as was proved by the stubborn evidence of the census returns of the government itself, as managed by our enemies.

The wisdom of the New South, then, must be in pursuing the sharp line which divides the neglect from the idolatry of riches. If they be pursued as an end instead of a means, they become your ruin instead of your deliverance. If riches when acquired are employed to enervate your manhood with costly pomps and luxuries instead of being consecrated to the noble uses of charity and public spirit, the richer the New South becomes the weaker she will be. The problem you have to learn



is how to combine the possession of great wealth with the personal practice of simplicity, hardihood and self-sacrifice. That people which makes selfish, material good its God, is doomed. In this world of sin the spirit of heroic self-sacrifice is the essential condition of national greatness and happiness. The only sure wealth of the State is in cultured, heroic men, who intelligently know *their duty* and are calmly prepared to sacrifice all else, including life, to maintain the right. Well then did the President of the Confederacy utter these golden words, that "the spirit of self-sacrifice is the crown of the civic virtues." I know that there is a generation, "O, how lofty are their eyes and their eyelids lifted up," who boast that their cuteness is in pursuing the "main chance," and who flout this virtue of disinterestedness as a weak folly; and yet for lack of this virtue their prosperity is ever perishing and their material civilization is ever, like the tawdry pyrotechnics of some popular feast, hurning out its own splendors into ashes, darkness and a villainous stench of brimstone. The New South then needs wealth, but it also needs men, high-minded men, undebauched by wealth, who, like the "high privates" of the Confederate ranks, shall know how to postpone ease and the delights of culture for the invincible endurance of hardship and danger.

2. Subjugation presents to the honorable conquered man another alternative of temptations. The one is that of moral disgust, prompting him to turn with proud disdain from all concern with public affairs, and wrap himself like a hermit in the folds of his own self-respect. It is to the best natures that this is most alluring; how attractive is the thought of thus easing one's infinite disgusts? How plausible the argument which says: Let those who have by fraud or force usurped the helm bear the responsibility of wrecking the ship. But the error of this resort is that it neglects the claims of patriotism and robs the State, in the moment of her need, of the virtues and faculties most essential to her deliverance. These unbending spirits who cannot be reconciled to disgrace are the very ones that can now be least spared. To conquer the burning repugnance to all the loathsome incidents of misconception, slimy slander, corruption and ingratitude with which one must meet in serv-

ing a State under the eclipse of subjugation, this may be a cross as bitter as death. But how many of our noblest and best have already borne the cross of *death* in the same cause?

The alternative temptation is yet more seductive to the more supple temperament. This is to exaggerate and pervert the plea of acquiescence in the inevitable; to cry, "Oh there is no use nor sense in contending against fate," and on this argument to act the trimmer and turncoat. How much easier is this to the pliable temper? And it may be, how profitable to the pocket. It is so sweet a relief to the lassitude which such a mind experiences at being ever in the self-respecting the righteous and the unsuccessful minority. Ah, how tiresome is it to such a man to hold up the standard of principle when it is unsustained by the breeze of popularity! Poor soul, how his arms ache, and how do they crave rest in the arms of the corrupt majority.

But even by the light of that policy, which such men make their pole-star, it would be better, while recognizing the inevitable, still to cleave to moral consistency and principle. For I surmise that when you seek a market for your capacities in the *forum* of the new regime, its managers will tell you that turncoats are decidedly a drug in that market. The demand is utterly overstocked, the market glutted. It is the men who have convictions and who cleave to them, who are the article in demand; in demand even with political adversaries, who, themselves, have no principles. For such men, however venal, soon learn the truth that the turncoat who could not be trusted to cleave to his principles, can as little be trusted to stick to the master who has bought him.

3. It behooves the New South, in dismissing the animosities of the past, to see to it that they retain all that was true in its principles or ennobling in its example. There are those pretending to belong to this company who exclaim: "Let us bury the dead past. Its issues are all antiquated, and of no more practical significance. Let us forget the passions of the past. We are in a new world. Its new questions alone concern us." I rejoin: Be sure that the former issues are really dead before you bury them! There are issues which cannot die without the death of the people, of their honor, their civiliza-

tion and their greatness. Take care that you do not *bury too much*, while burying the dead past: that you do not hurry the inspiring memories of great patriots, whose actions, whether successful or not, are the eternal glory of your race and section; the influence of their virtues, the guiding precedents of their histories. Will you bury the names and memories of a Jackson and Lee, and their noble army of martyrs? Will you hurry true history whose years are those of the God of Truth?

There is one point on which you insist too little, which is vital to the young citizens of the South. This is, that he shall not allow the dominant party to teach him a perverted history of the past contests. This is a mistake of which you are in imminent peril. With all the astute activity of their race, our conquerors strain every nerve to pre-occupy the ears of all America with the false version of affairs which suits the purposes of their usurpation. With a gigantic sweep of mendacity, this literature aims to falsify or misrepresent everything; the very facts of history, the principles of the former Constitution as admitted in the days of freedom by all statesmen of all parties; the characters and motives of our patriots; the purposes of parties; the very essential names of rights and virtues and vices. The whole sway of their commercial and political ascendancy is exerted to fill the South with this false literature. Its sheets come up, like the frogs of Egypt, into our houses, our hed chambers, our very kneading troughs. Now, against this deluge of perversions I solemnly warn young men of the South, not for our sakes, but for their own. Even if the memory of the defeated had no rights; if historical truth had no prerogatives; if it were the same to you that the sires whose blood fills your veins, and whose names you bear, be written down as traitors by the pen of slanderous history, still it is essential to your own future that you shall learn the history of the past truly. For the institutions which are to be, however unlike those which have been, must have a causal relation to them: must be in some sense the progeny of them. The chrysalis is very unlike its progeny, but none the less its traits determine those of the gorgeous butterfly. The acorn is not like a tree, yet its species determines the shape and qualities of the monarch of the forest. To-morrow's configuration of the planets

may be very dissimilar from that of to-day, but it will be rigidly consequential thereon. Hence the astronomer who misconceives and misstates the positions of the orbs to-day, must inevitably err in his prediction of their conjunctions to-morrow. So if public men will gratify their spite, or revenge, or lust of sectional power by misrepresenting the late events, they thereby condemn themselves to fatal blunderings and mistakes in prognosticating that future which can only be the caused sequel to this. If you would not be mere blunderers in your new constructions, then you must understand aright the structure of those recent actions on which they must found themselves. You will seek to learn them, not from a Greeley or a Henry Wilson, but from a Stephens and a Davis. While you do not allow your judgment to be hoodwinked by even the possible exaggerations of our own patriots, still less will you yield your minds to the malignant fables of those partisans who think they can construct history as unscrupulously as a political ring. Our age presents the strange instance of a numerous party, who think they can circumvent the resistless forces of truth by systematically misnaming facts and fallacies, who are deliberately building a whole system of empire on the substitution of light for darkness and darkness for light, of good for evil and evil for good, calling that master in our government which was servant, that patriotism which was treason, and that treason which was true, law-preserving patriotism, and that aggression which was righteous defense. If you wish to be buried deeper than thrice buried Troy beneath the final mountains of both defeat and shame, go with these architects of detraction. They are but arraying themselves against that unchangeable God who has said: "The lying tongue is but for a moment, but the lip of truth shall be established forever."

I have admitted, young gentlemen, that constitutions and laws may change, but honor, justice and right are immutable. Be loyal to these in all novel emergencies, and you will act safely. If this virtue, the foundation of all the civic, exists in you, it will, it must manifest itself most plainly in reverence and enthusiasm for the heroic and the self-sacrificing of your own people and State. Their actions have placed the right before you incorporate, with all the definiteness of outline and

vividness of coloring which belong to concrete realities. Their actions concern your hearts by virtue of all the ties of neighborhood and patriotism. As long as the hearts of the New South thrill with the generous though defeated endurance of the men of 1861; as long as they cherish these martyrs of constitutional liberty as the glory of their State and its history, you will be safe from any base decadence. If the generation that is to come ever learns to be ashamed of these men because they were overpowered by fate, that will be the moral death of Virginia, a death on which there will wait no resurrection. But I do not fear this.

I recall what my own eyes witnessed at the last great civic pomp in which I was present. This was the installment of that statue of Jackson near our State capitol, which Virginia received as the tribute of British statesmanship and culture to her illustrious dead. At this ceremonial there were gathered almost the whole intelligence and beauty of what was left of the old commonwealth. As the long procession wound through the streets marshaled and headed by General Joseph E. Johnston, under the mild glory of our October sun, while the atmosphere was palpitating with military music and the whole city was gone upon its house-tops, it was easy to perceive that all eyes and all hearts were centering upon one sole part of the pageant, and this was not the illustrious figure that headed it, the commander in so many historical battles, bestriding his charger with his inimitable martial grace; nor was it the cluster containing the remnant of Jackson's staff. We might have supposed that we would receive some reflected distinction from the luminary to which we had been satellites so near, and that some romantic curiosity might direct itself to those who had habitually seen him under fire, heard, and borne those orders which had decided memorable victories, and bivouacked under the same blanket with him; but no eye sought us. Then came hobbling a company of two hundred and thirty grizzled men with empty sleeves, and wooden legs, and scarred faces, and hands twisted into every distortion which the fiery fancy of the rifle-ball could invent, clad in the rough garb of a laboring yeomanry, their faces bronzed with homely toil; this was the company for which every eye waited, and as it passed the

mighty throng was moved as the trees of the forest are moved by the wind, the multitudinous white arms waved their superb welcome, and the thundering cheer rolled with the column from end to end of the great city. It was the remnant of the Stonewall Brigade! That was the explanation. This was the tribute which the sons, the daughters, the mothers of Virginia paid *to sturdy heroism in defeat*. And as I saw this my heart said with an exultant bound, "There is life in the old land yet!"

## TO MAJOR GENERAL HOWARD.<sup>1</sup>

Chief of the Freedmen's Bureau, Washington.

Sir: Your high official trust makes you, in a certain sense, the representative man of the North, as concerns their dealing with the African race in these United States. It is as such that I venture to address you, and through you all your fellow-citizens on behalf of this recently liberated people. My purpose is humbly to remind you of your weighty charge, and to encourage you to go forward with an enlarged philanthropy and zeal in that career of beneficence toward the African which Providence has opened before you. Rarely has it fallen to the lot of one of the sons of men to receive a larger trust, or to enjoy a wider opportunity for doing good. At the beginning of the late war there were in the South nearly four millions of Africans. All these, a nation in numbers, now taken from their former guardians, are laid upon the hands of that government of which you are the special agent for their protection and guidance. To this nation of black people you are virtually father and king; your powers for their management are unlimited, and for assisting their needs you have the resources of the "greatest people on earth." Your action for the freedmen's good is restrained by no constitution or precedents, but the powers you exercise for them are as full as your office is novel. We see evidence of this in the fact that your agents, acting for the good of your charge, can seize by military arrest any one of their fellow-citizens of African descent, for no other offense than being unemployed, convey him without his consent, and without the company of his wife and family, to a distant field of industry, where he is compelled to wholesome labor for such remuneration as you may be pleased to assign. Another evidence is seen in your late order, transferring all causes and indictments in which a freedman is a party, from the courts of law of the Southern States to the bar of your own commission-

1—Appeared in *New York Weekly News*, Oct. 21, 1865.

ers and sub-commissioners for adjudication. I beg you to believe that these instances are not cited by me for the purpose of repeating the cavils against the justice and consistency of the powers exercised in them, in which some have been heard to indulge. My purpose is not to urge with them that there is no law by which a free citizen can be rightfully abridged of his liberty of enjoying the *otium cum dignitate* so long as he abstains from crime or misdemeanor therein, merely because he wears a black skin, while the same government does not presume to interfere with the exercise of this privilege by his white fellow-citizens, even though they be those lately in rebellion against it; that this military arrest and transference to the useful though distant scene of compulsory labor, is precisely that penalty of "transportation" which Southern laws never inflicted, even on the slave, except for crime and after judicial investigation; that these commissioners for adjudicating cases to which freedmen are parties, are in reality judges at law, appointed by you, for every city and county in eleven States, and empowered to sit without jury, and to decide without regard to the precedents or statutes of the States; which would exhibit your bureau as not only an executive, but a judicial branch of the government, established without constitutional authority, and that a hundred fold more pervasive in its jurisdiction than the Supreme Court itself; and that this "order" has, by one stroke of your potent pen, deprived eight millions of white people of the right of a trial by jury, guaranteed to them by the sixth and seventh additional articles of the United States Constitution, in every case where a freedman happens to be a party against them. I repeat, that I have not adduced these instances for the purpose of urging these or such like objections; (it does not become the subject to cavil against the powers exercised by his conquerors), but only to impress you with the obligation, which the fullness of your powers brings upon you, to do good to your charge upon a great scale.

I cannot believe that means will be lacking to you any more than powers. At your back stands the great, the powerful, the rich, the prosperous, the philanthropic, the Christian North, friend and liberator of the black man. It must be assumed that the zeal which waged a gigantic war for four years,



which expended three thousand million of dollars, and one million of lives, in large part to free the African, will be willing to lavish anything else which may be needed for his welfare. And if the will is present, the ability is no less abundant among a people so wealthy and powerful, who exhibit the unprecedented spectacle of an emersion from a war which would have been exhausting to any other people with resources larger than when they began it, and who have found out (what all previous statesmen deemed an impossibility), that the public wealth may be actually increased by unproductive consumption. With full powers and means to do everything for the African, what may he not expect from your guardianship?

The answer which a generous and humane heart would make to this question, must of course be this: that it would seek to do for the good of its charge *everything which is possible*. But more definitely I wish to remind you that there is a *minimum* limit, which the circumstances of the case forbid you to touch. Common sense, common justice says: that *the very least you can do for them must be more than the South has accomplished*, from whose tutelage they have been taken. To this measure, at least, if not to some higher, your country, posterity, fame, and the righteous heavens, will rigidly hold you. The reason is almost too plain to be explained. If a change procured for the Africans at such a cost brings them no actual benefit, then that cost is uncompensated, and the expenditure of human weal which has been made was a blunder and a crime. Thus it becomes manifest that the measure for the task which you have before you, is the work which the South accomplished for the negro while he was a slave. The question, how much was this? is a vital one for you; it gives you your starting point from which you must advance in your career of progressive philanthropy. Listen then.

First, for the physical welfare of the negro the South has done something. A rapid increase of population and longevity are a safe index of the prosperous and sane condition of the bodies of a people. The South has so provided for the wants of the negro that his numbers have doubled themselves as rapidly as those of the whites, with no accessions by immigration. The census returns show that the South so cared for him that

the percentage of congenital defects and diseases, these unfailing revealers of a depressed physical condition, idiocy, blindness, deafness, dumbness, hereditary scrofula, and such like ills, was as small as among the most prosperous Northern States. The South gave to her negro men, on an average, a half pound of bacon and three pounds of breadstuffs per day, besides his share in the products of his master's kitchen-garden, dairy and orchard; and to the women and children at a rate equally liberal. If, in some neighborhoods, the supply was less bountiful than the above, there were a hundred fold more in which it was even more abundant. The South gave to every negro, great and small, a pair of shoes every winter, and to the laboring men an additional pair at harvest. She clothed them all with a substantial suit of woollens every winter, an additional suit of cotton or flax each summer, and two shirts and two pair of socks per year, while the adults drew their hat and blanket each. She furnished each negro family with a separate cottage or cabin, and, during the severe weather, with about one-third of a cord of wood per day, to keep up those liberal fires on which his health and life so much depend. She provided, universally, such relief for his sickness that every case of serious disease was attended by a physician with nearly the same promptitude and frequency as the cases of the planters' own wives and daughters; and in all the land never was a negro fastened to his bed by illness but he received the personal, sympathizing visits of some intelligent white person besides; master, mistress or their agent, who never went to his couch empty-handed. His dead universally received decent and Christian burial, where the bereaved survivors were soothed by the offices of Christianity. The South so shielded the negro against destitution, that from the Potomac to the Gulf, not one negro pauper was ever seen, unless he were free, and not one African poorhouse existed or was needed. Her system secured for every slave, male or female, a legal claim upon the whole property, income, and personal labor of his master, for a comfortable maintenance during any season of infirmity brought upon him by old age, the visitation of God, or his own imprudence, however protracted that season might be: a claim so sure and definite that it could be pursued by an action at law

upon the slave's behalf; a claim so universally enforced and acquiesced in, that its neglect, or the death of a helpless slave through destitution, was as completely unknown among us as cannibalism. The South met that claim, which the free laboring men of other lands have so often had sorrowful occasion to argue, amid pallid famine, and with the fearful logic of insurrections and bloodshed, the claim of "the right to labor," and has met it so successfully that she has secured to every African slave capable of labor, without even one exception among all her millions, remunerative occupation, at all times, and amid all financial convulsions and depressions of business. That is, she has found at all times such occupation for all of them as has procured for them, without excessive toil, a decent maintenance during their active years, an adequate and unfailing provision for old age, a portion for their widows, and a rearing of their children. The South has so far performed these duties to the bodies of the Africans that no community of them have ever, in a single instance, amid any war, or hlight, or drouth, or dearth, felt the tooth of famine on its vitals, or so much as seen the wolf, destitution, at its door.

For the culture of the negro's mind and character, the South has also done something. She has not, indeed, fallen into the hallucination that the only processes of education are those summed up in the arts of reading and writing—facts which were not prevalent among those literary dictators of the ancient world, the compatriots of Pericles and Plato—nor has she deemed it a likely mode to communicate these useful arts to the ebony youth, to gather three hundred of them into one pandemonium, under a single overtasked "school-marm" or bald-pated negro, and duh the seething cauldron of noise, confusion and "negro-gen gas," a "primary school." But thousands and tens of thousands has she taught to read (and offered the art to ten-fold more, who declined it from their own indolence), through the gentle and faithful agency of cultivated young masters and mistresses, a process prohibited, I boldly assert, *quicunque vult* by no law upon the statute-book of my State, at least. But this tuition, extensive as it has been, is the merest atom and mite, in the extensive culture which she has given to the African race. She received them at the hands

of British and Yankee slave traders, besotted in their primeval jungles, for the spontaneous fruits of which they lived in common. She taught the whole of them some rudiments of civilization. She taught them all the English language, a gift which, had they been introduced into the Northern States as free men, in numbers so large, they would not have received in three centuries. She taught all of them some arts of useful labor, and as large a portion of them as any other peasantry learned the mechanical arts. With the comparatively small exception of the negroes upon large estates, belonging to non-resident owners, the South has placed every negro boy and girl, during his or her growth, under the forming influence of white men and ladies, by whom they have been taught some little tinctures of the cleanliness, the decencies, the chastity, the truthfulness, the self-respect, so utterly alien to their former savage condition, and a share of courtesy and good breeding which would not disgrace any civilized people. Of the young negresses, who would otherwise have grown up the besotted victims of brutal passions, the great majority have been, at some stage of their training, introduced by the South to the parlors and chambers of their women, from whom they have learned to revere and imitate, to some degree, that grace and purity, that sweet humanity and delicacy of sentiment which glorify the Southern lady above all her sex; and under her watchful and kindly eye, has her dark-skinned sister been taught the agencies and domestic arts which make woman a blessing in her home. The boys and youths, by the same influences, have become the humble, yet affectionate, companions of their masters, and have imbibed some of their intelligence and principle. Herein was the great educational work of the South, potent and persuasive as it was simple. By her system, every man and woman of the superior race, yea, every child, was enlisted in the work of the culture of the inferior, and the whole business of domestic life was converted, by interest and affection alike, into a schooling of the mind and character.

This culture has been so far successful that the African race, lately rude savages, was raised to such a grade that, according to high military authority in the United States, they

were fit to make armies as efficient as those recruited in the "great, free and enlightened North"; and in the judgment of a powerful party in that country (a party which embraces the major part of that particular corner which has the prescriptive right of knowing everything), they have been made, under Southern tutelage, fully equal to the rights and duties of voters and rulers, in the most complicated of governments. Now, feeling that it does not become a subject of that government, one recently conquered by the great North, to dispute its *dicta* on these points, I shall of course assume that they are correct. Here, then, is what the South has done for the development of the negro's mind.

Nor has our section neglected that noblest and highest interest of all races, the spiritual interest of the negro. She has diffused among the blacks a pure gospel. She gave him the Christian Sabbath, and fortified the gift with laws and penalties, capable of being executed in his behalf against his own master—laws so efficacious that enforced Sabbath labor was almost utterly unknown to him. She gave him a part in every house of worship built throughout her border (for never have I heard of one church in all these States where the slaves were not admitted along with their masters), besides building more temples for his exclusive use than the Christianity of the North has built for Pagans, in all Hindostan and China together. She has given him evangelical preaching, unmingled with the poison of Universalism, Millerism, Socinianism, Mormonism, or with the foreign and disastrous element of politics. For nearly all the church-members of this people are connected with the great orthodox and evangelical denominations; and having been a preacher to Africans for twenty years, I have never yet heard a sermon addressed to them, or heard of the man who had heard it, in which the subject of abolition or pro-slavery was obtruded on their attention by a Southern minister. In one word, the South has so far cared for their souls as to bring five hundred thousand of them into the full communion of the church, thus making them at least outward and professed Christians—a ratio as large as that prevailing among the whites of the great, Christian North.

These facts concerning the work of the South for the

slaves, I give without the fear of contradiction. The son of a slaveholder, an owner of slaves by inheritance, reared and educated among them, laboring for them and their masters all my professional life, I know whereof I affirm. Every intelligent citizen of the South will substantiate these statements, as within the limits of moderation, and as only a part of those which might be made.

When I claim that the South did thus much for the Africans, I am far from boasting. We ought to have done much more. Instead of pointing to it with self-laudation, it becomes us, with profound humility towards God, to confess our shortcomings towards our servants. He has been pleased, in His sovereign and fearful dispensation, to lay upon us a grievous affliction, and we know He is too just to do this except for our sins. While I am as certain as the sure word of Scripture can make me concerning any principle of social duty, that there was nothing sinful in the relation of master and slave itself, I can easily believe that our failure to fulfill some of the duties of that righteous relation is among the sins for which God's hand now makes us smart. And it does not become those who are under His discipline to boast of their good works. No; verily we have sinned; my argument is that you must do more for the negro than we sinners of the South have done.

I have written wittingly the words, *you* must do it for them. The South cannot. Your people have effectually disabled them therefor. They have done so by taking away our wealth. The South is almost utterly impoverished, and is able to do little more than to keep destitution from her own doors. But a more conclusive reason is the alienation which the armed and clerical missionaries of the North have inculcated in the breasts of these people, lately so affectionate and contented. The negroes have been diligently taught that their masters were their enemies and oppressors, that their bondage was wicked and destructive of their well-being, and especially that the religious teachings of all Southern ministers were "doctrines of devils," because they would not shout the shibboleth of abolition. The consequence is that the black race will no longer listen to the Southern people, or be guided by them. Take as evidence my own instance, which I cite precisely for

the reason that it is not in the least peculiar, but reflects the common experience of all ministers and people here. Before the advent of your armies, plantation meetings were held weekly in the different quarters of the congregation, on Saturdays, in working time, cheerfully surrendered by the masters for that purpose, which brought religious instruction within two or three miles of every house. They are now all at an end. Six years ago my congregation pulled down the substantial house, built by their fathers only thirty years before, with walls as solid as living rocks, which was entirely adequate to hold the whites, and replaced it by a larger. One prominent reason was that it was not large enough to hold the servants also. They constructed in the new house three hundred commodious sittings exclusively for the blacks. Last Sabbath, under a bright and cheerful sun, those sittings were occupied during public worship by precisely three persons; and at the afternoon service, held in a chapel-of-ease, primarily for the blacks, there was not one present. Thus the North has prevented the South from doing its former work for the good of the African; consequently it must make its account to do it all itself.

But while I assert this, I would bear my emphatic testimony against the falsehood and injustice of the charge that the Southern people wish to cast off and ruin the negro, in a spirit of pique and revenge for his emancipation. That they regard this measure as neither just nor wise, is perfectly true. But they have promised to acquiesce in it as a condition of peace; that promise they intend faithfully to keep; and they universally regard slavery as finally at an end. There is nothing more manifest than that the North, amid the flame and heat of all its animosities, knows and feels that this people will not be the one to break its new covenant, hard as its conditions are; and that the freedom of the late slaves and the authority which has dictated it are secured from attack by us. And I boldly testify that this magnanimous people has not voluntarily withdrawn its humane interest from the blacks; that it earnestly desires their prosperity; that it wishes to give them employment and opportunity, and to co-operate in their maintenance as far as possible; that they do not cast off the negroes, but it is the negroes who cast them off. Yea, the people of

the South are this day extending to tens of thousands of black families a generous sympathy in the midst of their own heavy losses and deep poverty, which we challenge the Christian world to surpass in its splendid philanthropy: in that we still refuse to cast off those families, although, by reason of the incumbrance of old persons, sick, and little children, their present labor is worse than worthless to us, and we know we shall receive no future recompense in the labor of the children we are thus rearing *gratis* for other men as independent of us in future as we are of them. And this is done (oftentimes in spite of a present requital of insolence, misconception, ingratitude and a petty warfare of thefts and injuries) by Southern gentlemen and ladies, who appropriate thereto a part of the avails of their own personal labors, undertaken to procure subsistence for their own children. And this is done, not in a few exceptional cases, but in a multitude of cases, in every neighborhood of every county, so that the numbers of destitute freedmen under which the able hands of your Bureau now faint, are not a tithe of those who are still maintained by the impoverished people of the South. And this is done simply because humanity makes us unwilling to thrust out those for whose happiness we have so long been accustomed to care into the hardships of their new and untried future. And unless you can expect this delicate sentiment to exhibit a permanence which would be almost miraculous under the "wear and tear" of our future poverty, I forewarn you that you must stand prepared for a tenfold increase of your present responsibilities, when these families are committed to you. That tenfold burden you must learn to bear successfully.

Having shown you the starting point of that career of beneficence to the African, from which you are solemnly bound to God and history to advance, I now return to strengthen the already irresistible argument of that obligation. If the South, with all its disadvantages, has done this modicum of good to this poor people, the North, their present guardians, with their vast advantages, must do far more. The South was the inferior section (so the North told us) in number, in wealth, in progress, in intelligence, in education, in religion. The South (so the North says) held the Africans under an antiquated, unright-



eous and mischievous relation—that of domestic slavery. The North now has them on the new footing, which is, of course, precisely the right one. The South was their oppressor; the North is their generous liberator. The South was hagridden in all its energies for good (so we were instructed) by the “barbarism of slavery”; the North contains the most civilized, enlightened and efficient people on earth. Now, if you do not surpass our poor performances for the negro with this mighty contrast in your favor, how mighty will be the just reprobation which will be visited upon you by the common sentiment of mankind and by the Lord of Hosts? If you do not surpass our deeds as far as your power and greatness surpass ours, how can you stand at His bar, even beside us sinners? He has taught us that “a man is accepted according to that which he hath, and not according to that which he hath not.” To this righteous rule we intend to hold you, as our successors in the guardianship of the negro.

If there are any who endeavor to lull your energies in this work, by saying that the negro, being now a free man, must take care of himself like other people; that he should be thrown on his own resources, and that, if he does not provide for his own well-being, he should be left to suffer, I beseech you, in the behalf of humanity, of justice and of your own good name, not to hearken to them. I ask you solemnly whether the freedmen have an “even start” in the race for subsistence with the other laboring men of the nation, marked as they are by difference of race and color, obstructed by stubborn prejudices, and disqualified (as you hold) for the responsibilities of self-support, to some extent, by the evil effects of their recent bondage upon their character? Is it fair, or right, or merciful to compel him to enter the *stadium*, and leave him to this fierce competition under these grave disadvantages? Again, no peasantry under the sun was ever required or was ever able to sustain themselves when connected with the soil by no tenure of any form. Under our system our slaves had the most permanent and beneficial form of tenancy; for their master’s lands were bound to them by law for furnishing them homes, occupations and subsistence during the whole continuance of the master’s tenure. But you have ended all this, and consigned four mil-

lions of people to a condition of homelessness. Will the North thus make gipsies of them, and then hold them responsible for the ruin which is inevitable from such a condition?

But there is another argument equally weighty. By adopting the unfeeling policy of throwing the negro upon his own resources, to sink or swim as he may, you run too great a risk of verifying the most biting reproaches and objections of your enemies. They, in case of his failure, will argue thus: "That the great question in debate between the defenders of slavery and the advocates of emancipation was whether the negro was capable of self-control: that the former, who professed to be more intimately acquainted with his character, denied that he was capable of it, and solemnly warned you of the danger of his ruin, if he was intrusted with his own direction, in this country, and that you, in insisting on the experiment in spite of this warning, assumed the whole responsibility. Sir, if the freedmen should perchance fail to swim successfully, that argument would be too damaging to you and your people. You cannot afford to venture upon this risk. You are compelled by the interests of your own consistency and good name, to take effectual care that the negro shall swim; and that better than before. In the name of justice, I remonstrate against your throwing him off in his present state, by the inexorable fact that he was translated into it, neither by us, nor by himself, but by you alone; for out of that fact proceeds an obligation upon you, to make your experiment successful, which will cleave to you even to the judgment day. And out of that fact proceeds this farther obligation: that seeing you have persisted, of your own free will, in making this experiment of his liberation, you and your people are bound to bestow anything or everything, and to do everything, except sin, to insure that it shall be, as compared with his previous condition, a blessing to him. For, if you were not willing to do all this, were you not bound to let him alone? When the shipmaster urges landsmen to embark in his ship, and venture the perils of the deep, he thereby incurs an obligation, if a storm arises, to do everything and risk everything, even to his own life, for the rescue of his charge. If, then, you and your people should find that it will require the labors of another million of busy hands, and

the expenditure of three thousand millions more of the national wealth, to obviate the evils and dangers arising to the freedmen from your experiment upon their previous condition: yea, if to do this, it is necessary to make the care and maintenance of the African the sole business and labor of the whole mighty North you will be bound to do it at this cost.

And I beg you, sir, let no one vainly think to evade this duty which they owe you in your charge, by saying that perhaps even so profuse an expenditure as this, for the benefit of the Africans, would fail of its object; because they hold that making a prosperous career is one of those things like chewing their own food, or repenting of their own sins, which people must do for themselves, or else they are impossible to be done; and that so no amount of help can make the freedmen prosperous as such, without the right putting forth of their own spontaniety. For, do you not see that this plea surrenders you into the hands of those bitter adversaries, the Pro-Slavery men? Is this not the very thing they said? This was precisely their argument to show that philanthropy required the Africans in this country should be kept in a dependent condition. If your section acquiesces in the failure of your experiment of their liberation on this ground, what will this be but the admission of the damning charge that your measure is a blunder and a crime, aggravated by the warning so emphatic, which your opponents gave you, and to which you refused to listen?

But I feel bound, as your zealous and faithful supporter in your humane task, to give you one more caution. The objectors who watch you with so severe an eye have even a darker suggestion to make than the charge of headstrong rashness and criminal mistake in your experiment of emancipation. They are heard gloomily to insinuate that the ruin of the African (which they so persistently assert must result from the change) is not the blunder of the North, but the foreseen and intended result! Are you aware of the existence of this frightful inuendo? It is my duty to reveal it to you, that you may be put upon your guard. These stern critics are heard darkly hinting that they know Northern statesmen and presses who now admit, with a sardonic shrug, that the black man, deprived of the benignant shield of domestic servitude, must of course perish

like the red man. These critics are heard inferring that the true meaning of Northern Republicanism and Free Soil is, that the white race must be free to shoulder the black race off this continent, and monopolize the sunny soil, which the God of nations gave the latter as their heritage. They take a sort of grim pleasure in pointing to the dead infants, which, they say, usually marked the liberating course of your armies through the South, in displaying the destitution and mortality which, they charge, are permitted in the vast settlements of freedmen under your care; in insinuating the rumors of official returns of a mortality already incurred in the Southwest, made to your government, so hideous that their suppression was a necessity; and in relating how the jungles which are encroaching upon the once smiling "coasts" of the Mississippi, in Louisiana, already envelope the graves of half the black population in that State! And the terrible inference from all this, which they intimate is, that the great and powerful North only permits these disasters because it intends them; that, not satisfied with the wide domain which Providence has assigned to them, they now pretend to liberate the slave whom they have seen too prosperous under his domestic servitude, in order to destroy him, and grasp, in addition, the soil which he has occupied.

Now, sir, it is incumbent on you, that the premises on which, with so dangerous a plausibility, they ground this tremendous charge, be effectually contradicted by happy and beneficent results. You must refute this monstrous indictment, and there is only one way to do it, by actually showing that you conserve and bless the African race, multiply their numbers, and confirm their prosperity on the soil, more than we have done. I repeat, the North must refute it thus. For, of course, every Northern man, while indignantly denying and abhorring it, admits (what is as plain as the sun at midday) that if the charge were indeed true, it would convict his people of the blackest public crime of the nineteenth century; a crime which would be found to involve every aggravation and every element of enormity which the nomenclature of ethics enables us to describe. It would be the deliberate, calculated, cold-blooded, selfish dedication of an innocent race of four millions to annihilation; the murder, with malice prepence, of a nation!

not by the comparatively merciful process of the royal Hun, whose maxim was, that "thick grass is cut more easily than thin," summary massacre; but by the slowly eating cancer of destitution, degradation, immorality, protracting the long agony through two or three generations, thus multiplying the victims who would be permitted to be born only to sin, to suffer and to perish; and insuring the everlasting perdition of the soul, along with the body, by cunningly making their own vices the executioners of the doom. It would include the blackest guilt of treason being done under the deceitful mask of benefaction and by pretended liberators. The unrighteousness of its motive would concur with its treachery to enhance its guilt to the most stupendous height; for upon this interpretation of the purpose of the North, that motive would be, first to weaken and disable its late adversary, the South, by destroying that part of the people which was guilty of no sin against you, and then, by this union of fraud and force, to seize and enjoy the space which God gave them, and laws and constitution guaranteed. This, indeed, would be the picture which these accusers would then present of your splendid act, that you came as a pretended friend and deliverer to the African, and while he embraced you as his benefactor in all his simple confidence and joy, you thrust your sword through and through his heart, in order to reach, with a flesh wound, the hated white man who stood behind him, whom you could not otherwise reach. The deed would receive an additional shade of blackness from every reproach which the North has ever uttered against us for our supposed oppression of the black man, from every profession of your superior humanity toward him—from every assertion of your superior civilization, light and Christianity. For, is it not the righteous penalty of the servant who knew the will of his Divine Master and did it not, to be beaten with many stripes? If the North should, indeed, after all its claims of the traits which exalt a people, have this most accursed deed fastened upon it, then would be fulfilled against it that awful warning which the Son of God thundered against the most boastful of the abusers of His teachings: "Thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell." And on the face of all the earth there has been no people since that doomed

race who said: "His blood be upon us and our children," against whom the voice of impartial history has pronounced deeper execrations than those which would await you. Once more, could such a crime be perpetrated and the dire judgments of God fail to follow? Could your posterity hope to escape the fated tread of that divine retribution which hitherto has pursued, with inevitable steps, the crimes of all the nations, from the primeval East to the farthest West, with the double scourges of God?

Up, then! honorable Sir: Yea, I would exclaim through you: Up! thou great, Christian North: cleanse thy skirts from this foul charge; deliver thy children from this fierce indignation of heaven by the splendid liberality and success of your efforts for the freedmen. Up and silence your accusers, by lifting these Africans, with the strong hand of your beneficence, to your own prosperity. Do not listen to these boding assertors of the impossibility of the exploit; but so lavish your enlightened care and labor, and wealth and love, as to compel impossibility itself.

The conclusions to which, I trust, you have now come with me, are briefly these, that the North is bound by the logic of events and of its own acts to become the chief guardian and nurse of the freedmen. That the South is, without its own fault, disabled from doing more than a very little of this work in future. That the North must do more for them than the South ever did, and that in the proportion of her own superiority over us, as that superiority is asserted by herself, and of the advantage and justice which freedom possesses, according to her, over slavery, that the North cannot throw on the African, unaided, the task of securing his own destiny, nor plead that the attainment of social prosperity is a thing which cannot be done for those who do not effect it for themselves; because these are just the points which the South urged against this change and which the North denied in insisting upon it, and because you alone are the authors of the change. That your section has thereby incurred a sacred obligation to bestow on the African a well being higher than that of the state from which you took him, no matter how much it may cost you. And that, if the North fails in this, it confesses itself an enormous criminal,

Here, then, is your task, and these are its conditions. There is no more sincere aid which I can render you in it than to give you a sober sketch of its real difficulties, and with this I shall close.

One of your difficulties is in the thriftlessness of the Africans themselves, and their want of intelligent foresight; a trait which was caused, not by domestic servitude, but by the savage condition from which they were taken, and which we had partially corrected when they were taken out of our hands. (For this is just the character which all savages exhibit, and especially those of the torrid climes, which know no winter.) Our system assigned an effectual remedy for the mischievous effects of this trait by making it the interest and duty of every slave owner, and of all his adult children and heirs to teach the servant care and industry, and to guard against his thriftlessness. How you are to repair it under your system I, of course, must not presume to dictate. I will only venture to say that the correction of it must manifestly require a vast amount of careful and patient tutelage of a multitude of hands. The census returns of 1850 gave the South two hundred and eighty thousand slave owners. Every one of these, with their wives, many of their adult children and a multitude of overseers and agents were interested teachers and guardians of the African, and many of them exceedingly diligent, and devoted all their time to this work. Hence it is manifestly a very moderate estimate that your bureau must employ in the tutelage and guardianship of these helpless people not less than a quarter of a million of persons, and as the powerful motive of interest and property is extinguished they must all be of better average character than Southern slave owners to do their work as well without that motive as these did with it. They must be all of thorough integrity and intelligence.

Another of your difficulties will be found in the enormous misconceptions which now fill the minds of the freedmen. The mischief of one of these I have already indicated. It suited your purposes, during the season of strife, diligently to teach the negro that the white people of the South were their oppressors and enemies. Well, sir, they have learned your lesson effectually, and will not speedily unlearn it. The conse-

quence is that you have thereby stripped yourself of the aid of eight millions of white people in your arduous task, and these, the white people among whom the larger part of the freedmen still live, among whom alone are to be found persons familiar with African character, and among whom alone has there ever been, or will there ever be an ingenuous personal affection for individuals of that race: We have lost the ability to guide, counsel, or instruct them.

The larger part of them evidently confound liberty with license; and to them, liberty means living without earning a living. Accustomed to see their masters performing little manual labor (because they were necessarily occupied with the more important, and often more arduous, labor of superintendence), the freedmen assume that, to be free, is to be like their masters in the former particular. They forget this little difference, that a man cannot be usefully occupied in the labor of superintendence, when he has nobody to superintend. Your first task, sir, will be to convince them of this mistake, and, as I have proved, you are bound to do this, without causing or permitting them to suffer any painful consequence of this error:

Your emissaries, armed and clerical, diligently taught them that all the labor rendered by them in servitude was uncompensated; and that every dollar of the proceeds of that labor taken by the landholder, was a robbery from them. (A good and certain home and livelihood at all times, sustenance for their families, provision for their decrepitude, and maintenance for those they left behind them are, in the eyes of these philosophers, no compensation at all, even for that labor which is least skilled; because, I presume, they were so secure and regular. And it is the established doctrine of the Abolition school, that, while labor is entitled to wages, capital is not; in accordance with which truth, those good people, as is well known, always lend out their money for nothing, and pay away the whole profits of their costly factories in wages to operatives.) The consequence of this doctrine among the freedmen is this: They argue that all the property in the country being the fruit of their unrequited labor, they may now help themselves to a fair return, whenever and however they can. Hence a habit of what we old fashioned Southerners used to call



"theft," which renders them of rather doubtful utility as hired laborers. You will have a great deal of trouble, sir, in correcting this mistake; and again, I urge that you are bound to do this, without permitting or causing the freedmen to taste any of its bitter consequences. For, I reason of this as of all other misconceptions which they learned of you, that you are solemnly bound not to let them suffer for what was your error. What, will you punish them for believing you? It would be a monstrous iniquity. You have this task then, gently to educate them out of this innocent mistake of stealing everything which comes to their hand, by "moral suasion," without stocks, whipping posts, jails, or any such harsh measures; and meantime, to generously repair all the evil consequences of those thefts, to themselves or others, out of your own inexhaustible pockets. Do you not think, sir, that to effect this the "school-master" will have to go "abroad" pretty considerably?

Thus one mischievous mistake chases another through their ignorant minds, fostered by designing and malicious men; and each one is a fatal obstacle in that path of sober industry where alone their welfare is to be found. You have a great task, sir, in causing them to unlearn these misconceptions. How many embarrassing self-contradictions your people will have to make in performing that task, it is not for me to indicate.

Another of your difficulties will be found in the necessity for the displacement of a very large part of the black labor and population in many districts of the South. My own county may be taken as a fair example of the other parts of Virginia. There were in it about eight thousand blacks. Our wisest men of business are unanimous in declaring that under the new system of hiring labor, the industrial pursuits of the county cannot employ profitably more than one-third (some say not more than one-fifth) of the former labor; at prices which will give subsistence to the blacks. And their opinion is manifestly correct, because every business man who is questioned, individually, declares that he is constrained to reduce the labor employed by him in some such ratio. Now, this fact is not cited by me to argue from it the superior economy and productiveness of the former system, in that it was able to employ, upon the same soil, in a remunerative manner, three times or five times as

much labor. (And that the employment of it was remunerative is proved beyond a cavil by the prosperity of employers and laborers.) The only use I make of the fact is to show that two-thirds of this black population should at once emigrate; or it becomes unemployed, destitute, suffering and vicious. But the local attachments of the African are predominant; and that spirit of adventure and enterprise, which carries the Virginian to the front wave of every tide of pioneer population, is as foreign to his nature as frost is to his fervent native clime. The temper of the negro is to do just what he has been used to, and nothing else. Here, sir, you have a problem which will tax your ingenuity and force; how to displace two-thirds of the half million of blacks in Virginia to a new soil, when they do not wish to go, have no capital, and are deficient in knowledge and thrift; and to do this without a result of widespread destitution, domestic distress, disease and death.

But, perhaps, the greatest of your difficulties is the one which has been hitherto least appreciated—the novelty of your task. You, sir, are appointed to do what no other mortal has hitherto done successfully: to transmute four millions of slaves, of an alien race and lower culture, all at once into citizens, without allowing them to suffer or deteriorate on your hands. You have no precedents to guide you. You cannot resort to the pages of political history to find there the lights which may show you your momentous duties. But there is no other guide in political science. The machinery of moral causes, which forms a political society, is too complex for any finite mind to foresee, by its *a priori* speculations, what wheels will be moved by the spring which he touches. His only safe guide is the experience of previous results under similar conditions. If he attempts to act beyond this his action is, in the worst sense, *experiment*; a blind guess, leading him by haphazard to unforeseen results. In the sciences of material things, these experiments have been useful and are legitimate. The philosopher may properly deal thus with his metallic ore; he may venture his unproved hypothesis concerning it; he may submit it to new solvents, or acids, or fires; oftentimes he will find that his hypothesis is false and leads to nothing; but sometimes he will find that it is the occasion of stumbling upon the key to one of

nature's precious secrets. Now, his justification is that the ore which he eats with corrosive acids, or melts in his furnace, suffers nothing in this blundering process of questioning after new truth. It has no nerves to be fretted under his handling; no heart to be wrung; no sentient or intellectual destiny to be perverted or destroyed under his mistakes, and, above all, no immortal soul to be lost in his hands. But, in social science, mere experiments are crimes; for the subjects of them are immortal intelligences, endowed by God with a moral destiny, with hearts to bleed under errors, and never-dying souls to be lost. Fearful, then, is the responsibility of him who handles a social revolution new in the history of man. He must march; yet he cannot know whether or not the path which he selects will lead him over the bleeding hearts and ruined destinies of his own charge. For such, the only adequate director is the Spirit of God; and his best resort is prayer. To that resort I sincerely and solemnly commend you; and close by subscribing myself, Your very obedient servant,

Sept. 12, 1865.

ROBERT L. DABNEY,  
Prince Edward County, Va.

## ABSTRACTIONISTS.<sup>1</sup>

There are two ways of reasoning about human affairs. One is, to bring measures to the test of fundamental principles, and abide by their decision firmly. The other is, to inquire: "What is the dictate of policy, of expediency, of present utility?" There are two classes of minds in the world: the speculative, and the practical. The former seeks to analyze its objects of thought, to arrive at ultimate truths, and from those truths, to deduce its practical conclusions. The other only considers propositions, in the light of their practical consequences as perceived by itself. The former looks at general laws: the latter at immediate results.

Now the latter class of people have applied to the former, in these days of ours, a name, which is at least new in its present sense: *abstractionists*. It is subject of joy, for the sake of the credit of the Church, that this name was first invented among politicians; but it is to be lamented, that the Church's people have, to her disgrace, borrowed the name with its contemptuous meaning, from the politicians. An abstraction, properly understood, means, a proposition considered as naked and general, stripped of all the accidental circumstances which belong to any individual case under it. But the idea which some of those seem to have, who use the word as a term of contempt, is that it is just something which is abstruse. Those who know what they mean by it, if there are any such, probably intend by abstractions, *speculative principles*, as opposed to practical conclusions.

Among the many good results of popular government in church and state, there is this unfortunate one: that its usages tend to teach the governing minds to despise speculative thought, and reason only from present expediency. It is the popular mind, with which they have to deal: and that mostly in the fugitive form of oral address, or the flimsy newspaper argument, where the whole result intended, is a momentary im-

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeared in "*Presbyterial Critic*," June, 1855.

pression. The minds addressed, are not trained to speculation, and could not comprehend it. Hence, public men are tempted to disuse it, till they become incapable of it themselves; and all profundity and breadth of view are neglected, or even despised, in reasoning of public affairs. Men aim only to catch the public ear by some shallow argument of present expediency; and brand all appeals to more fundamental truths "as abstractions,"—gossamer speculations unworthy to hind the strong common sense of practical people. Thus, it is proposed, in federal politics, to institute some measure, the argument for which is present utility. Its opponents object, that it is not within the legitimate scope of the federal institutions; and to institute it would be a virtual breach of constitutional compacts. "Ah," says its advocate, "that is one of your 'abstractions.' Isn't the measure a good one in its practical effect? Then why not adopt it?" Or, in church affairs; one good brother proposes, that the Church shall take into its own official hand, the business of education, and imbue it properly with the Christian element. Another brother objects, that to educate is not the divinely appointed function of a church. "Why," asks the first, "don't you admit that all education ought to be Christian education?" "Oh, yes," says the respondent; "but it is the function of Christian parents; combining, if necessary; but as parents, not as presbyters." "What of that?" says the first; "our church schools are very good things: very harmless things as yet: and where is the difference between a combination of certain men as Christian parents, to make and govern a certain sort of school, and a combination of the same men as presbyters to make the same sort of school?" "There is the difference of the principle involved," it is answered; "and it is never safe to admit a false principle." "Pshaw," says the first; "that is nothing but one of your 'abstractions.'"

The term is intended to be one of contempt. It is supposed to describe something uncertain, vague, devious, sophistical: as opposed to that which is positive, sensible and reliable. The "abstractionist" is represented as a man, fanciful and unreliable; who pursues the intangible moonshine of metaphysical ideas, until he and his followers "wander, in devious mazes lost." But if any of the men who attempt abstractions are vague

or sophistical, is it because they use abstract propositions; or because they misuse them? If men choose to be careless or dishonest in their thinking;—if they will mix or vary the terms of their propositions, or commit any other logical errors, they will be erroneous, however they may reason. And we assert, as an offset to this reproach, that no truths can be general, except those which are abstract: for by the very reason that concrete propositions are concrete, they must be particular, or individual; and therefore no deduction made from them, can have any certainty when it is attempted to give it a general application. The concrete is best for illustration, but for general reasoning it is useless: and all gentlemen who are accustomed to boast, that they are not “abstractionists,” thereby confess that their arguments are only illustrations. If they wish to glorify their logic therein, they are welcome.

But that any *educated man* should indulge in this slang of the hustings and the demagogue, is derogatory to his own intelligence, and his fraternity. For every man of information ought to know, that abstractions are the most practical things in the world. His reading ought to remind him how directly the most abstract truths have led on to the most practical conclusions; how inevitably they work themselves out into practical results, and how uniformly the most practical truths depend for their evidence on those which are abstract. There is no branch of human science, which does not teem with illustrations of this. Our anti-abstractionists would probably consider it rather a shadowy question, if they were called to debate whether or not Galvanism and Magnetism are generically distinct or like; two somethings impalpable, invisible, imponderable, which we hardly know whether to call substances or not. Yet, on the answer to that question depended the invention of the *Magnetic Telegraph*, with all its very practical results, in the regulating of the prices of breadstuffs, the catching of fugitive rogues, and the announcement of the end of dead emperors. Latent caloric strikes us as a rather abstract thing: a something which no human nerve ever has, or ever will feel, and which the most delicate thermometer does not reveal. And about this shadowy something, a very shadowy proposition has been proved by your contemptible abstractionists: namely, that in certain cases, sen-

sible heat becoming latent, increases elasticity. This is the abstraction which revealed to mankind the secret steam engine; and which now propells our boats, spins our cloths, grinds our flour, saws our lumber, ploughs the ocean with our floating palaces, whirls us across continents in the rail-cars, and sometimes scalds or cripples us by the score. A rather practical thing, is this abstraction.

Or, let us take illustrations from the moral sciences. Every well informed man ought to know that the abstract question, whether general ideas are substances, conception, or names, once almost threw Europe into fits, armed universities, and even commonwealths against each other, and probably cost John Huss his life. Whether what we call *causation* is a real and necessary connexion, or merely an observed sequence of events, is a very abstract question: but it makes all the difference between a God and no God: yea, all the difference between the blessings, civilization, wholesome restraints and happiness of religion, and the license, vice, atrocity and despair of Atheism. Indeed your thorough Atheist, is the only true and consistent anti-abstractionist. Jonathan Edwards' work on the will, is usually thought rather an abstract book, on a rather abstract subject. Its great question is, whether volitions are certain, according to the prevalent bent of the dispositions, or self-determining. But the answer to this abstract question decides authoritatively between Calvinism and Pelagianism. Presbyterians, we think, have found the latter quite a practical matter! Can human merit be imputed to another human being, in God's government, as it is in man's? "A very useless, unpractical question," you say. "I don't care to speculate in such unsubstantial merchandise." Well, from the affirmative answer to that question Thomas Aquinas deduced the grand system of *Papal Indulgences*. Here is an abstraction out of which grew a good many important matters: such as a good many millions of crowns transferred out of the pockets of good Catholics, into those of "his Holiness the Pope";—the zeal of Luther against Tetzels, and thence the Reformation—with English liberty and through that, American; with a good many other very practical affairs. But enough. The most abstract propositions have often divided nations, and led to wars, revolutions, and

convulsions: just as that abstraction, "whether a man can rightfully own as property, the labor of a fellow man without his voluntary consent," now threatens our nation with fratricidal and suicidal war. There is no practical truth, in the evidence of which an abstract one is not concerned. There is no abstract truth which may not lead, by logical necessity, to practical results. How unthinking, and ignorant ought a man to be, in order to utter an honest, sincere sneer against dealings and dealers in abstractions? Very stupid indeed. Again; such sneers are always inconsistent. Every man is an abstractionist, except perhaps the materialist—atheist, who does not believe there is any God, because he has never seen Him, or that he has any soul, because he cannot handle it. Those who contemptuously disavow it, only do so when the abstractions are against them; and strenuously use similar abstractions, on their own side. How literally has this been verified in federal politics? In truth, no man can help it; for the foundation of every man's right, theory, or project, whatever it may be, is on an abstract principle. And the veriest red-Republican of them all, who thinks he has trampled down every abstraction, still relies on his own favorite ones, to sustain his radicalism. Says the Agrarian: "Here is my rich neighbor, who has more than he can possibly use, or even waste. How much better to take away a part, and give it to me, who need a little capital to enable me to be a producing citizen. You will thereby benefit me, the state, and my rich neighbor himself: for he is so rich that it is an actual injury to him." You object, that the rights of property are in the way; and that it is of more fundamental importance to the state, that those rights should be protected, and that every man should be certain of the rewards of his industry, than that property should be equally distributed. These are in his eyes, nothing but abstractions. Why should a citizen be kept back from obvious and present advantage, by the gossamer threads of those abstract rights? So he helps himself liberally to his neighbor's property, and thus becomes a man of property himself. And now, lo! he forthwith invokes those abstract rights of property, to defend his new acquisitions against other red-Republicans, as greedy as himself, but still poorer.

But the serious and lamentable point about all this decry-



ing of abstractions is, that where it is intelligently and deliberately uttered, it is thoroughly profligate. What is it all, but a demand that principle shall give way to expediency? All the principles of morals, in their last analysis, are abstractions. The distinction between right and wrong is an abstraction, as pure and disembodied as was ever presented by metaphysics. And in short, the difference between an honest man and a scoundrel, is but this: that the former is governed by a general principle, which is an abstraction, in opposition to the present concrete prospect of utility; while the latter is governed by his view of present expediency, in opposition to the general principle. What else do we mean by saying that a man is *unprincipled*? In the eyes of such a man, the restraints of a constitution which he has sworn to support, are abstractions, whenever they seem to oppose the present dictates of expediency. All those broad and wise considerations, which show how much more important is a consistent adherence to general principles, than the gain of a temporary and partial advantage by their violation, are but abstractions. And with the same justice, though with greater impiety, it might also be said, that the immutable principles of eternal rectitude, to which God compels all the interests of the universe to bend, at whatever cost of individual misery, are abstractions. What, for instance, is the principle, which constitutes the necessity for an atonement? What, except that necessary connexion, which the unchangeable perfections of God have established between the abstract guilt of sin, and the penalty? "Now here is a penitent man," says the Socinian; "a wondrous pious, proper man: he is never going to sin any more: (the self-determining power of his own will has decided that.) Who will be the worse for his pardon? Why should he go to perdition, poor fellow, for a mere abstraction?"

All this sneering has ever sounded mournfully in our ears, as a revelation of the unscrupulousness of the age. And to be called an abstractionist, has we confess, been always received rather as a compliment, than a reproach. It puts us in admirably good company;—along with all the profound thinkers, and the stable, noble souls, whose brave motto has been "*Obsta principiis*." And when the philosophic historian shall come to write, in future ages, the history of the Decline and Fall of the

Empire Republic, he will mark it as the most glorious tribute to the public virtue of one school of our statesmen, that they were branded by unthinking or unscrupulous adversaries, as *Abstractionists*. And let none say, that in these words, we have violated that delicate neutrality towards national parties, which becomes a religious periodical. The honor of both the great parties of the nation, equally approves and demands the sentiment. For the sneer would have seemed as profligate and odious in the ears of a Hamilton or a Marshall, as in those of a Madison or a Calhoun.

"But, is there not a style of reasoning, which calls itself general and abstract, which is, in fact, unreliable, misty, and deceptive? This," some will say, "is what we mean by abstractions." Well, good reader, you express your meaning very unfortunately. When next you hear men using propositions, which they suppose general, in a manner vague and sophistical, we pray you, in the name of intelligence, sound logic, and sound principle, do not express your dissent, by saying that they are *abstractions*, say simply that they are *untrue*.

## THE CRIMES OF PHILANTHROPY.<sup>1</sup>

If this phrase appear to any reader paradoxical, a very little reflection will convince him that it is only so in appearance. For, the greatest organized wrongs which the civilized world has seen perpetrated in modern times, upon the well-being of mankind, have been committed under the amiable name of humanity. No despotic government now avows the ruthless purpose of self-aggrandizement and of the gratification of hatred and the lust of power; but its pretense is always the good of society, and the welfare of the governed. The wars of the "Holy Alliance," which drenched Europe in blood at the beginning of this century were all undertaken nominally for the peace and liberties of Europe. No demagogue confesses, in popular governments, the greedy ambition or avarice which proves to be his secret motive: but he seeks only the good of the "dear people," while he betrays them into mischievous anarchy or legislative atrocities.

The religious persecutions, which have made nominal Christianity the scourge of humanity, have all professed the same kindly purpose. When the excellent St. Augustine first exerted his influence and logic to make them respectable, he argued against the Donalists, that, as the parent chastises a wayward son to save him from the ruin of his vices; or as a physician rouses the lethargic patient by pungent cataplasms, so the church, the guardian of souls, might lovingly rescue her wayward children from the curse of heresy, by imprisonments, fines and stripes. And this is the argument of persecution in all ages. All the racks, the funeral pyres, the *autos da fe* with which the Inquisition blackened Europe, were justified by this plea of love. Men were slain with protracted and exquisite tortures, out of mere humanity, and to save their beloved souls at the expense of their sinful flesh. It was from the same amiable impulse that Simon de Monfort went from the devout participation in the Lord's supper, to the storming and sack of Albigen-

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeared in "*The Land We Love*." December, 1866.

sian towns, and the butchery of their women and children. These enormities of a darker age are now as much deplored by enlightened and liberal Catholics as by Protestants themselves. The crusades against the Moslems also, justified their inconceivable barbarities, in part by a humane pretence: It was the protection and assistance of Holy Palmers, in their pilgrimages to the sacred places in Palestine, which moved the crusaders, along with zeal for the honor of Christ's sepulchre.

Another instance is presented by the colonial enterprises of the Spaniards and Portugese in tropical America. In all these voyages and wars, which entailed upon the feeble aborigines the untold horrors of extermination, a devout and philanthropic enthusiasm was an active cause. Columbus himself was as much a missionary as a votary of science, in his life-long dreams of discovery. He proposed to the King and Queen of Spain the extension of the blessings of the gospel, as much as of their empire, as the end of his projects; and wherever he and his successors landed upon the soil of America, they set up the cross alongside of the banner of Castile. Of the Spanish adventurers, Prescott says: "Their courage was sullied with cruelty; the cruelty that flowed equally—strange as it may seem—from their avarice and their religion; religion as it was understood in that age, the religion of the crusader. It was the convenient cloak for a multitude of sins, which covered them even from himself. The Castilian, too proud for hypocrisy, committed more cruelties in the name of religion, than were ever practiced by the pagan idolater or the fanatical Moslem. The burning of the infidel was a sacrifice acceptable to heaven, and the conversion of those who survived, amply atoned for the foulest offenses. It is a melancholy and mortifying consideration, that the most uncompromising spirit of intolerance—the spirit of the Inquisitor at home, and of the Crusader abroad—should have emanated from a religion which preached peace on earth, and good will towards man!" So, the contrast between Pizarro and his two partners, for the conquest of Peru, begins by invoking in the most solemn manner, the names of the "Holy Trinity and our Lady the Blessed Virgin."—"In the name of the Prince of Peace," says Robertson, "they ratified a contract, of which plunder and bloodshed were the objects." Of the same tran-

saction Prescott remarks: "The invocation of heaven was natural, where the object of the undertaking was, in part, a religious one. Religion entered more or less into the theory, at least, of the Spanish conquests in the new world." \* \* \* "It was indeed a fiery cross that was borne over the devoted land, scathing and consuming it in its terrible progress; but it was still the cross, the sign of man's salvation, the only sign by which generations yet unborn were to be rescued from eternal perdition."

Thus it would seem the piety of Christendom has projected itself upon Asia and America as a flood of rapine and destruction. Nor can the Anglo-Saxon race of Protestants claim advantages over the Peninsular, in the results of their enterprises in America, as to the aborigines. They crossed the ocean professedly in pursuit of freedom, religious liberty and civilization. The consequence of their appearance has been likewise the extermination of the red man.

But the missions planted by ecclesiastics in tropical America presented a still more glaring perversion. Until the beginning of this century, in some of these missions, military expeditions were annually equipped by the holy fathers, against the neighboring pagan tribes, piously termed *casas de las almas*, "hunts for souls," for the purpose of capturing as many persons as they could, and subjecting them to a compulsory baptism and training. These involuntary converts were then distributed among the families of the priests or the Christianized Indians, to be trained by servitude to habits of industry and morality. Thus, armed men were seen, in the name of humanity and mercy, assailing and burning towns, murdering helpless families, and dragging the wretched survivors into bondage with all the ferocity of the African slave-catcher.

When the cruelties of these various forms of religious fanaticism are considered, it is not allowable to account for them by asserting the conscious hypocrisy of the perpetrators. From the days of Saul of Tarsus until these, many a persecutor could doubtless say, that they "verily thought" they ought to do these things. In many a scourge of humanity, the evidences of sincerity have been unquestionable; and the general integrity of

character has served only to enforce the rigor of their determination.

In the instances which have been now cited, other purposes have been mixed with those of philanthropy, and have perhaps been the main ones, while the humane designs were secondary. But yet more remarkable examples have occurred, where the most cruel inflictions which have cursed mankind, have sprung out of the express purpose to contribute to his welfare; and where the very apostles of humanity have shown themselves the most vindictive towards their fellow men. The reader of history will recall to mind that the African slave trade, with all its perpetual intestine wars, its burnings, massacres and rapes, its chains and dungeons, and the horrors of the "middle passage," originated in a compassionate plan of the benevolent Bartholomew Las Casas, to relieve the Indians of the Spanish Islands from the burden of slavery. It was his sympathy with their sufferings, which caused him to invent this expedient, of substituting the hardier Negro under the yoke.

But the eminent instances of the crimes of philanthropy are those of our own age. And among these, none stands higher in this bad eminence than the "*reign of terror*" under the ascendancy of the French democrats, at the close of the last century. The first revolution in France was especially the work of its infidel, humanitarian philosophers; who taught the perfectibility of human nature, the natural rights and equality of man, and the intrinsic injustice of all distinctions of rank; who traced to these all the miseries of human society, and heralded the era of political equality as a second golden age. The motto of the fiery democrats trained in their school was, *liberty, equality, fraternity*. They boasted that their mission was to restore to all orders of men, through the potency of these principles, that universal happiness and harmony, plenty and love, of which civilized societies had hitherto been cheated through the malignant cunning of priests and magistrates. Well, they overturned the throne, the nobility, the altar, the constitution; they held in their hands the naked constituent elements of the commonwealth, to remould them as they listed, and to give the fullest application to their principles; and the result was the *Reign of Terror*. *Marat* became the organ of the party of "liberty,

equality, and fraternity" through the press; and the ferocious Danton through the tribune. The former through his newspaper, *L' Ami du Peuple*, croaked his perpetual demands for blood, like a ghou, saying that it would never be well with the cause of fraternity, until two hundred and sixty thousand heads fell before it. This was the precise number of the human hecatombs, which this apostle of humanity demanded, to satiate his Moloch. Danton, on the other hand, mounted the tribune, which was the pulpit of this new gospel of philanthropy, to thunder his demands for accelerating the guillotine, or authorizing the September massacres. And it was ever in the name of this amiable cause, that Robespierre, that incarnation of snaky cruelty, devoted fresh thousands to murder. It is not necessary to repeat the pictures of this season: the very term, Reign of Terror, carries to every student of history a meaning more descriptive of misery, cruelty, crime, and agony, than any details could convey. The total of these sacrifices, as coolly given by the socialist *Proudhomme*, tells the tale better than rhetoric can do it; it was one million and twenty two thousand, made up as follows: of the guillotined in Paris, eighteen thousand; victims slain or executed in Lyons, thirty-one thousand; murdered by the ferocious Carrier at Nantes, thirty-two thousand; slain in battle, massacre, and execution, in miserable La Vendee, nine hundred and forty thousand. Of this total, about forty-five thousand were women and children!

From that day to this, the Jacobin party have unfailingly exhibited the same frightful combination of philanthropic cant, with a truculent ferocity of spirit. "With their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips." And this manifestation is, if possible, only the more conspicuous, amidst the professed Christianity of Old and New England. Do these pretended assertors of the rights of man organize themselves as Chartist clubs? Then we see them wielding, as their chosen instruments, against all who presume to question the safety and wisdom of their plans, fiery invective and denunciation, the incendiary's torch, and secret assault or assassination. Or does the Jacobin creed embody itself again in the professed "Liberal Party" of Bright on the other side of the Atlantic, and of his cousin-germans—the progressives—on this side? Then the same contrast is displayed between the atrocity

of their spirit, and the humanity of their pretensions, by the zest with which the latter have perpetrated, and the former have applauded, the recent horrors in the late Confederate States. Humanity, in their mouths, means, favor to those who assist their overweening and headstrong projects, with ruthless injustice and violent persecution, robbery, arson and murder, to all who presume to doubt their propriety.

This recent type of Jacobinism illustrates the cruelty of humanitarian philanthropy in our day, by two of its favorite schemes, abolition of negro slavery, and the Peace Society. The former, in the British colonies, has just glorified its zeal for human welfare, by converting a number of thousands of prosperous fellow citizens into paupers and exiles, and a race of contented, useful, and improving peasantry, into savages; while it is now, on this side of the ocean, "in the full tide of successful experiment," advancing towards the same benevolent result. The former have been engaged for thirty years, in painting the horrors of war, in describing with moving words, the prodigal waste of human happiness and life which attends it, and in denouncing even defensive war, as an invention of the devil, utterly unworthy of a Christian nation. It is also the same men usually, who declaim against the harshness and barbarity of the capital punishments denounced against the chief crimes by our criminal laws. Now the plain people amongst us, who draw their maxims of common sense from the Bible, have questioned, from the first, the genuineness of this humanity; it appeared to them a little queer, that those special advocates of forbearance, were almost always peculiarly overbearing in their temper towards dissentients, that they were very intolerant in their advocacy of tolerance, and very belligerent in the tone in which they urged peace. The true *animus* of the party was correctly foreshadowed by the spirit of one of its members, who appeared, a quarter of a century ago, to advocate the Peace Principles, at the bar of a dignified ecclesiastical assemblage in America, and to enlist its support for them. In his bustling labors in the lobby, he declared that Christianity forbade to the individual, and to society, all violent resistance of injury; that to retort the intended suffering on the aggressor was inconsistent with true humanity: and that all which was necessary to disarm assault, was, for everybody to practice a determined passivity and non-



resisting love. The members of the body which he addressed were then characterized by a sturdy, old-fashioned sense, for which it has unfortunately not been since so conspicuous. They attempted to induce the ardent man to bring his principles home to his own person, in such a case as the following: "Suppose that some son of Belial should attack you without provocation, in the absence of all legal protection, and with evident purpose of injury to life or limb: what would you do?" "I should declare my purpose of non-resistance," he replied, "and appeal with confidence to his conscience. It is the sight of resistance, which gives resolution to the rising impulses of aggression; a thoroughly peaceful attitude will surely awaken the better nature of an assailant, and make him relent, before he strikes." "Yea, but," said they, "there are men in whom conscience and the better nature are effectually seared, who would only be encouraged by the prospect of non-resistance." "Still," answered he, "I would retain my passive attitude, and display the majesty of meekness, so that it would be impossible for him actually to strike." And these boastful words he uttered with an air of angry assumption, as foreign from his professed meekness as it was evidently adapted to provoke assault. The next day, the ecclesiastical body agreed, out of respect for the cause of humanity which he professed to advocate, to hear his views. He urged them with much warmth and self-confidence, to adopt resolutions committing themselves to his theory; and when the objections of sober good sense were urged, flew into a furious passion, denounced his opponents, and flung himself out of the house in true fighting temper.

This incident gives a correct type of the combined ignorance of their own hearts and of other men's, and errors of reasoning, by which this sect is infested. And it foreshadowed precisely, the fiendish temper with which they have themselves met the shock of real resistance. When they found a people who begged to be excused from the intrusions of their unauthorized meddling, and the propagation of their pet schemes of philanthropy, these peace-society men, who denounced even defensive war an inhuman crime; who—shuddered, sweet souls!—at the sight of a drop of the criminal aggressor's blood, and preferred that it should be spared even at the cost of the blood of the innocent; who were busy sending committees to the Czar as the

head of the first military monarchy of Europe, to teach him how wicked bayonets were, and remonstrating with the King of Dahomey against his royal slave-hunts; these opponents of capital punishments, who, more merciful than the "Father of Mercies," declared that it was quite cruel that he who sheds man's blood should have his blood shed by man; these superfine sentimentalists, paused in their sanctimonious pastimes, and, almost to a man, passionately joined the clamor of the party, who demanded the extermination of their fellow citizens, for the high crimes of daring to have opinions of their own, and asserting their own prescriptive rights. It was precisely from this quarter that the loudest howl for plunder, murder, famine and conflagration came! Abundant proof this, that the ruling motive of such philanthropy is not love, but an intensely selfish love of power, mental conceit, and hunger for applause.

This phenomenon is as curious as it is mortifying to the true friend of humanity. Hence the explanation of it is interesting, and, if it can be accomplished, profitable to all such. An attempt will be made towards the explanation, by setting worldly philanthropy in contrast with true Christianity. Although the former is perpetually borrowing the name and language of the latter, it will appear that they are contrasted in their principles, and the principles of godliness will help to explain those of the counterfeit.

Philanthropy proposes as its end, *advantage to man*. Christianity declares that *man's chief end is to glorify God, and enjoy Him forever*. Its doctrine is that "God hath made all things for Himself; yea, even the wicked also for the day of evil"; that "of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things; to whom be glory for ever and ever." Its one precept is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind, and strength; and thy neighbor as thyself."

It is very true that the humanitarians, clamorously reject this great proposition as an odious dogma. Just here, then, they and God join issue. They say that since disinterestedness is the property of every virtuous act, and selfishness is the hateful root of vice, in all other beings, it would be immoral in God, thus to propose Himself as His own supreme end, and to arrogate to Himself the services of all creatures, exhausting their well-being upon Himself. They urge that this would be selfish-

ness more enormous than that of sinful men, just as its claims are more vast. They exclaim that this scheme makes God the great egotist of the universe. On the contrary, they display their own scheme in enviable contrast for its disinterestedness, as making the welfare of our fellow men the chief end.

These cavils against the Christian law assume that it is intrinsically wrong for a being to direct his aims to his own well-being. But this is not true. There is a sense in which self-love is lawful, even for a creature; yea, the absence of it may be positive sin. There is another reason why the selfishness of fallen man is criminal: It is because a question of prior right intervenes. Our Creator puts in claims to the fruits of our existence, which are superior to all others; and therefore it is sin to be supremely selfish, because it robs our Maker of that which we received of Him. But God is indebted to none for His existence and powers. He alone is eternal, uncaused, and independent. Obviously then, it is invalid to reason that, because, in a creature, supreme egotism would be an odious crime, therefore it would be a vice in the uncreated God. That regard for one's own well-being which, even in the creature, may be a proper subordinate end, may be in the Creator a most righteous supreme end.

But Christianity can defend itself with more positive arguments upon this point. God, being immutable, is ever actuated by the same motives. But when His eternal purpose of creation and providence subsisted in His mind, "before He had made the highest part of the dust of the earth," or laid the foundations of the heavens, He must have been self-moved thereto; for the irrefragable reason, that nothing else existed besides Himself, to be a motive. Is it said that creatures, the future recipients of His beneficence, were present in thought, and were the motives of His purpose? The reply is at hand, that they existed as yet, only in His purpose; which purpose was the expression of His own subjective desire and impulse alone, seeing nothing but Himself existed. Hence the very purpose to create creatures to be the recipients of His bounty, was simply the result of self-gratification, because the perfections of nature thereby indulged were infinitely benignant. But whatever was God's motive in the earliest eternity, is His motive still; for He is without "variableness, or shadow of turning."

When it is remembered that we are creatures, it is easily concluded, that our highest duty is to God. He is the author of our existence, our powers, our happiness, and supporter of our nature. He is our proprietor, in a sense so high that all other forms of ownership almost vanish away, when set beside God's. He is, moreover, by His own perfections, the properest object of all reverence, homage, and suitable service. So that, manifestly, it is the highest virtue in the creature, that he should offer to God the supreme tribute of his being and service. But if it is obligatory on the creature to offer this, it cannot be wrong in God to accept it.

Hence, we repeat, God's most proper ultimate end, in all His creation and government, is the gratification of His own adorable perfections in His acting. And the creature's highest duty is not chiefly to seek his own good, or that of his fellow-creatures; but the glory of God. He is the center, in whom originated all beings, and to whom all should tend. His will and glory is the keystone of the whole moral order of the universe. As it was the gratification of His infinite activity which originated all creature existences, with all their powers of doing and enjoying, so it is His self-prompted desire to diffuse His infinite beneficence, which is the spring of all the well-being in the universe. And here is the conclusive answer to the cavil which we have been discussing: How can it be selfishness in God to make the gratification of His own nature His supreme law, where that nature is infinitely unselfish and benevolent? In this light, the objection is seen to be of a piece with that wretched philosophizing which argues, that, because the loving mother, the sympathizing benefactor, are actuated by their own subjective impulse, in succoring the objects of their kindness, and find pleasure in the act, therefore it is not disinterested. Common sense, as true philosophy, replies: aye, but is not the pleasure itself a pleasure in disinterestedness? What higher definition of a disinterested nature can be given, than to say that its most instinctive pleasure is in doing good?

Thus, as God's own most suitable end is the satisfaction of His own excellent perfections; so the creature's chief end is to glorify and enjoy Him. This benevolent God has, of course, given the duties of benevolence to man a large place in the law which he has enacted for men; but even in our freest acts of

beneficence to our fellows, we are required to have a reference supremely to Him whose creatures they are. Love to our neighbor is to be a corollary from love to our God. We are chiefly to seek His glory in their good, as in our own; and these are always in complete harmony. Hence it follows that whenever man makes his own, or his fellows' good his chief end, he necessarily comes short of that good; and the only way to gain it, is to seek the higher end. Nor is there a paradox, when we thus say, that in order that man may truly attain his own well-being, he must truly prefer something else to it. Is it not a parallel, and an admitted truth, to say, that it is only when the virtuous man prefers some better end than applause, in his actions, that they are truly virtuous and deserving of applause? An instructive instance of this great law of our well-being is found by every one in common life. Who has not experienced this: that the days and the efforts which have been especially devoted to our own enjoyment, have usually disappointed us of enjoyment, while the days, which we devote primarily to duty, are thickly strewn with wayside flowers of unexpected pleasure?

Christian philanthropy derives its efficiency, no less than its purity, from this, that it all flows from the Christian's love of his God. He is an object, who never disappoints us, who never changes nor forgets; who never shows Himself forgetful or neglectful of our affectionate service; who never disgusts our efforts by unworthiness; and who has pledged the most generous reward to every true act of humanity. But if we make man our chief end, he usually shews himself, soon, unworthy to be our end. He alienates our love; he disgusts us by the follies and crimes which cruelly counteract our efforts for his good; he renders us indignant by his ingratitude. Such an idol as this can never animate us with a devotion, which will rise to the pure and enduring self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Hence, if for no worse reason, worldly philanthropy is ever feeble, unsteady, evanescent.

But it is time to pursue, in turn, this part of the contrast. The latter scheme proposes as our most proper and virtuous end, not God's glory; (this would be, say they, to make God the infinite egotist) but man's good. *Advantage to man* is its highest aim. And this, the humanitarian claims, is true disinterestedness. This *forbids* selfishness as the ruling motive to man,

as it disclaims it for God. (Might they not as well say at once, *forbids* it to God, also; and thus disclose their real impiety?) This, therefore, they urge, is the true, the morally beautiful and amiable theory of life.

Let us see. By what logic can it be justly denied that whatever is made our highest ultimate end is practically made our God? It is nothing to the purpose that names and titles are politely exchanged, and man is still called the creature, and Jehovah the God. Virtually, the aggregate of humanity is made our true divinity, by being made our moral end; and Jehovah is only retained (if retained at all) as a sort of omnipotent expediency and Servitor to this creature-God. Further, this result is immediately seen to be involved; that, inasmuch as the philanthropist is himself a part of this aggregate humanity, "by nature equal" to any other part, he is a part of his own God! He himself is, in part at least, his own supreme end! Is there no inkling of a supreme egotism here?

But now, if humanity is our supreme end, and if this humanity is as truly embodied in one individual of the race, as in all, and if each individual is "by nature equal"; by what valid argument shall that man be refuted in the interests of philanthropy, who shall choose to say, that he recognizes in that humanity embodied in himself, his own nearest, and most attainable end? He may plausibly add, that nature herself sanctions this conclusion, by the powerful and instinctive principle of self-love which she has implanted; and yet more forcibly, that since man's finite powers can only serve this aggregate humanity, by serving some individual or individuals within it, and efforts directed equally to the whole must be wholly nugatory; and since nature has given to each man more efficient means to influence his own destiny than that of any other man, and more direct responsibility therefor, it is obvious that his truest virtue will be to seek his own personal good, in preference to that of any, or of all others? Such is precisely the process, stated with analytic precision, which passes in an involved and semi-conscious form, through the minds of myriads of the children of this world, determining them to the supreme indulgence of selfishness. Is not this but an expansion of the process by which Hobbes, that "Leviathan" of infidel philoso-

phers, concluded, that the normal state of man was a contest of each individual's supreme self-love against each other's?

And now, by what argument shall it be refuted, from the humanitarian premises? Will men attempt it, by adopting the scheme of Jonathan Edwards, which defined virtue as "love to being in general," and required the first love to be given to the greatest aggregate of being? Will they say that one should prefer the good of mankind to his own, because the race offers a larger aggregate of humanity than the individual? This will hardly be ventured at this day, after the extravagant deductions of Godwin's Political Justice have displayed the absurdity of the theory. But besides, since the devil and his angels are exceedingly numerous, and creatures majestic in natural endowments compared with man, it is probable that they present a greater aggregate of being than mankind; whence it would follow, that we are morally bound to prefer the welfare of demons to that of men. Shall the theory be amended, then, by saying that it is the largest aggregate of virtuous being, only, which claims our preference, and first love? Then, first, suffering humanity would share least; because ours is a guilty and depraved race; and usually, men's miseries (and so their need of philanthropic aid) are in proportion to their sins. And second: since God presents immeasurably the largest aggregate of virtuous being, this leads us back to God as our supreme end; precisely the result which the humanitarian desires to shun.

Or will the refutation of inordinate selfishness be sought from the more harmless theory of Jouffroy; that, as the human reason, educated by experience, compares the instinctive desires of its fellow men for their personal good, with its own, it recognizes their equality, and generalizes the law of the golden rule, as the proper moral order of the whole? The ready answer is, that if this is the moral order, then it is recognized by the pure reason as the obligatory order. But obligation implies an obligator; so that, by this process again, we are led back to God; and our virtue is made to consist in conformity to his supreme will. But, if the moral is rightfully the dominant faculty in man, does not this also make God our supreme end?

We re-affirm the charge, that on humanitarian grounds, an absolute selfishness is a logical conclusion; so that the boast of disinterestedness which they make, is found hollow; and the

reproach they attempt to cast upon Christianity is retorted upon themselves. It is a significant confirmation of this charge, that this egotistical conclusion has been expressly avowed by one school among those most subtle of anti-Christian philosophers, the German Idealists. This party, asserting that the whole materials of human thought are to be found in the data of our consciousness alone, then declare, that consciousness gives us naught but our own ideas, that what we delusively call the objective sources of our sensations and perceptions, are nothing more than the necessary limitations of our own thought and feeling. Thus no evidence remains for the existence of an outer world of either mind or spirit distinct from the conscious self; and the only universe which remains is the something which thinks. Self, God, the world, are reduced to one; and that one is not a personal being, but an eternal impersonal power of thought. "Now," says the German Pantheist, in the last refinements of his frightful theory; "since I, God, humanity, are one, let either God or humanity be the proper end of existence, since these are only developed consciously to me in myself, self is the nearest and properest object to receive this supreme homage; and absolute self-gratification is my highest rational end. Whatever I happen to prefer is to me, the truest and chiefest good; whatever I happen to will, is the highest right."

Hence the reflecting man need not be surprised to find these humanitarians, who set out with the proudest boasts of benevolence, end with the most engrossing selfishness. The highest professors of this creed have ever been the most cruel of men.

The impotency of this system for good is farther explained by comparison with another law of Christian benevolence. As the latter is founded on the love of God, for its motive, and looks to a future recompense for its personal reward, so it requires the Christian who "would go about doing good," to resemble his Saviour in his spirit of self-sacrifice. Says the Apostle John: "Hereby perceive we the love (of God) because He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren"—and Paul, suffering for God's people, "filled up that which was behind of the afflictions of Christ, in his flesh for His body's sake, which is the church." It is true that to purchase atoning merit, or make satisfaction to Divine jus-



tice for others' guilt is a high prerogative, in which the sufferings of the Son of God must be forever unapproachable. But in the lower sense, there is a true analogy between the work of the "Man of Sorrows," when he "bare our grief, and carried our sorrows," and the beneficence of his followers. In all their efforts to relieve human suffering Christians must suffer vicariously: they can only lift off the burden of a fellow man, by bearing a part of it themselves. Their philanthropic ministry is destined to be, like the humiliation of their Redeemer, essentially a season of trial; although cheered by not a few of those glimpses of solace drawn by hope from "the glory that should follow," which caused Christ, in the midst of His toils to "rejoice in spirit." The glory and blessedness are chiefly future, and are with God. Now these are the conditions of a life of true philanthropy; and the Christian's faith arms him with forces which enable him to fulfill them. But not so the philanthropy of the humanitarian. Its good element is nothing more than the natural law of sympathy. As this word indicates, this reflected emotion shares the pain by which it is excited; but the effort to relieve that pain is also succeeded by an instinctive pleasure, which in man's imperfect heart is never wholly disinterested, but involves some elements of self-love, and appetite for applause. So it appears that the *calculated end* of all such acts of beneficence is this personal pleasure. Does one say, that sympathy also acts by an instinctive and involuntary impulse? True; but can an uncalculating instinct be relied on, to produce and regulate a systematic life of benevolence? \*Nay verily—man will never be nerved to the habitual, sustained endurance of suffering, by an impulse to personal pleasure: it is contradiction.

One other fact remains to be mentioned, which the humanitarian studiously ignores, but which the Bible asserts. None but God can truly elevate fallen and suffering humanity. Death, and all the ills which are its foretastes, came by sin; and sin reigns in human hearts, with a dominion which nothing but omnipotent power can break. All that human love can do is to labor with God, as humble instruments, looking and praying that He may give "the preparation of the heart," and lift up the sufferers by a true and permanent restoration. Moreover, if our toils are a failure as to their objects, by reason of the withhold-

ing of this sovereign agency, they cannot be a failure as to God's glory and our recompense. These are sure, whether the sufferer rise or sink, if our efforts are made in love and faith. But now, it is manifest from this great truth, as it is shown by actual experience, that *failure* must be the result of all unbelieving philanthropy, in the end. Its objects refuse to be rescued thoroughly; or they sink again. In asserting this, we take our stand upon the field of history, and boldly ask: where is the human device for the amelioration of man's sin and misery, which has not terminated, sooner or later, in failure? Where is the form of liberal government, the moral reform society, the temperance society, the agency of civilization, which has accomplished its work, and preserved it? But when this worldly philanthropy fails, as fail it must, what is to solace its mortification, its disappointed self-love, its indignation at the unworthiness of its objects?

Another application of the fact of human depravity remains; it affects the philanthropists themselves, as well as their objects. Their justice, benevolence, and sympathy are imperfect fragments amidst the ruins of their fallen nature. These ruins, none but God can reconstruct; and this He does through the grace revealed in Christianity. The discussion has hitherto been conducted upon the assumption claimed by the humanitarians, that the motives prompting their intervention were innocent; and all that has been hitherto urged is their insufficiency. But this is not the whole of the argument. God's infallible truth declares that all men, the philanthropists and the sufferers, the philosophers and their pupils, are fallen creatures; that true righteousness is overpowered in them by sin, that the partial good impulses which remain as the reliques of paradise are inferior and weak, and that the various elements of selfishness are in the ascendant in every unregenerate will. Partial impulses of social affection, of generosity, of sympathy, of honor, illuminate in different degrees the natures of these men; and far be it from us to deny their sincerity, but they are not in the permanent ascendant. Sin is the ruler and tyrant of all natural hearts. Now, if these things are indeed so, and the humanitarians obstinately refuse to admit them, their blindness to the nature of their own motives only aggravates their recklessness, and the danger of mischief. Is their intervention for

their suffering fellow men prompted by genuine sympathy? Let it be admitted; but this principle is unstable; and so surely as they are men, the other principles, love of power, love of applause, conceit, pride, ambition, self-righteousness, or some of them, are mingled in some ratio, in every beneficent action. Let the unworthiness or ingratitude of the objects, or mortification of failure, or opposition concerning the methods of benevolence, supervene, and how easily, how naturally, do the movements of philanthropy slide into those of the malignant emotions. Thus is generated the monster, fanaticism; in which all that remains of the beneficent purpose is a pretext, to blind the mind of the fanatic to the true nature of his emotions, and to sanctify to himself all their enormities. The cold and glittering enthusiasm of the imagination is combined with the malignant passions of self-display, lust of power, and hatred; and the whole, borrowing the sacred name of philanthropy, goes forth upon its destroying career.

The true character of this fanaticism may be disclosed by easy tests. If love were the true spring of its pretended zeal, that benignant emotion ought to display itself consistently, in the general life, and especially in the daily practiced duties of home and family, which should hold the first place in every healthy conscience. But when the private life of your fiery declaimer against social wrongs is examined, it is usually found to be characterized by domestic harshness, injustice and selfishness; his wife, his children, his servants, feel little of that abounding beneficence which he delights to ventilate abroad concerning the wrongs of the distant and unknown. On the other hand, the men of practical kindness, who actually exercise a generous and self-denying benevolence, in that home-sphere, where benevolence is most practicable, are seldom found among these self-constituted assertors of the wrongs of humanity. Moreover, let any individual among the pretended objects of his sympathy be brought to their own door, and thrown upon this actual help; he will be very likely to find it a most unsubstantial dependence. The fiery philanthropist will speedily teach him that while he is very willing to gratify his malice by scolding his opponents, or his pride by parading his benevolence, he has little thought of sacrificing either his own money or convenience for the sufferer,

From this position, the mischievous and corrupting effects of preached crusades against organized social systems which are supposed to be evil, receives a facile explanation. Christianity and its true ministers make it their main business to address the individual; and their topics are his own duties and sins. They separate him, they tell him his spiritual necessities; they say: "Thou art the man"; they teach him to make his own spiritual amendment his chief care. Thus, by sanctifying each individual, human society is effectually regenerated; and organic evils easily disappear. But when once the pulpit is perverted to declaim habitually against the public sins of communities, and to agitate for their reform, the individual is encouraged to lose sight of his own errors (the only ones he is responsible for, or able to reform), and to occupy himself with the wrong-doings of others. But these are of course, painted in constant contrast with his own rectitude; so that this preaching, instead of inculcating humility and sanctity, is nothing but a ministration of spiritual pride, arrogance, and hatred. And hence its popularity. It is much more agreeable to an evil heart, to be reminded of its own superior excellence, and to be invited to the work of reviling its opponents, than to be summoned to the toils of self-discipline, the mortifications of personal contrition, and the crucifixion of carnal affections.

## REPLY OF R. L. DABNEY, D. D.,

To the Letter of General Joseph E. Johnston, Criticising  
Dr. Dabney's Narrative of the First Battle  
of Manassas.

*To the Editors of Richmond Dispatch, June 21, 1867.*

Gentlemen: Accident recently brought to my attention the remarks published in your paper of March 24th by General Joseph E. Johnston upon the narration of the part borne by the Stonewall brigade in the battle of Manassas contained in my life of General T. J. Jackson. So far as these corrections have revealed error in my statements, I receive them thankfully, and shall not fail to employ them, as soon as it is in my power, for the perfecting of the accuracy of my narration. The high position and services of General Johnston, which none honor and appreciate more cordially than myself, do indeed render it almost a presumptuous attempt to question the correctness of any of his representations, especially when made by one in my obscure place. But even to such a one the reputation for integrity of purpose, at least, is very precious. I therefore beg leave to exhibit in your columns some of the testimonies by which I suppose myself to be sustained in the statements made. I hope every reader will be charitable enough, when he examines these witnesses, to conclude that, if I have been misled, it was without evil intentions, and was not unnatural with such guides before me. I shall take up the points which I purpose to notice mainly in the order of General Johnston's letter.

1. But first, I must endeavor to acquit myself of the charge of disparaging some of General Jackson's comrades, whom, if I knew my own thoughts, I was only seeking, in my bungling way, to honor. General Johnston says: "This account of the battle does great injustice to General Beauregard, and to Bee's and Early's brigades and their commanders. General Jackson's great fame is in no degree enhanced by such disparagements of his associates." The reader is requested to bear in mind the following general caution against such impressions contained

in my preface, page 6: "And especially would I declare that, in relating the share borne by General Jackson's *comrades* and *subordinates* in his campaigns, I have been actuated by a cordial and friendly desire to do justice to all. If I shall seem to any to have done less than this, it will be my misfortune, and not my intention." But it is more to the point to refer to my words on page 215 of the narrative: "The other two" (reserve brigades) "*were those of Generals Bee and Jackson, and the heroism of these two* was sufficient to reinstate the wavering fortunes of the day," etc. Bee is mentioned first, and with the same approbation as Jackson. Is this a disparagement? On page 218, I say of Bee and Evans: "For two hours these two officers, with five regiments and six guns, had breasted the Federal advances," etc. (I had before stated that this advance was of 20,000 men.) Does this disparage Bee? On page 222 I attempt in my poor way to describe Bee's heroic end, exactly as it was detailed to me by those who saw it, in the most honorable words I could find. General Early and his brigade are mentioned by name, but their exploits are not described fully, because they acted on another part of the field, and had no special connection, as Bee had, with the movements of my own subject, Jackson. And finally, on page 228, to guard against any possible apprehension unjust to others, these words are inserted: "The object of this narrative has been to give such a sketch of the whole battle as to make the part borne by the Stonewall brigade and its leader intelligible, and to give fuller details of the conduct of the General whose life is the subject of this work. The reader will not infer from this that all the stubborn and useful fighting was done by Jackson and his command. *Other officers and other brigades displayed equal heroism, and contributed essentially to the final result,*" etc.

2. General Johnston questions my correctness in the account I gave of the surrender of Colonel Jackson's command to him at Harper's Ferry. The point of difference between them was, that whereas General Johnston claimed to relieve Colonel J., at once, the latter refused to surrender his trust until authorized in some shape to do so by those who had committed it to him—his State authorities. And the point of difference between General Johnston and me now is that I say Colonel J. was inflexible, and actually continued to hold his power until,

opportunistically, the authority to transfer it came in the shape of an endorsement of General Lee on a paper; while General Johnston says: "There was no display of inflexibility on Jackson's part," that he was enlightened by Major Whiting, and that my representation "does injustice to General Jackson's character." I did not conceive that it was my business as a historian to reflect whether the incident was favorable or unfavorable to General Jackson's character, but to tell the exact truth as it happened. That I did not misrepresent it is shown by the letter which General Johnston himself quotes, saying: "Until I receive further instructions from Governor Letcher or General Lee I do not feel at liberty to transfer my command to another, and must therefore decline publishing the order," etc. I have had the very letter containing General Lee's endorsement—which happily solves the difficulty—in my possession. (I returned it to Mrs. J., who doubtless has it now.) And if any one questions whether Colonel J. had receded from his position before receiving it, I would suggest that he ask the fact of his aid, Colonel James Massie, of Lexington, Va.

3. I now pass to another point. General Johnston, dissenting from any opinion that it would have been better to march the remainder of the Army of the Valley direct to the battlefield from Piedmont station, instead of waiting upon confused and dilatory trains of cars, says: "The fact that these troops were two days in marching twenty-three miles from (Winchester to Piedmont) shows that they could not have marched thirty-four miles, from Piedmont to the scene of action, in less than two days, and that the only hope of getting them into the battle was by the railroad."

I had spoken of Jackson as having made a forced march of *thirty* miles from Piedmont, which is charged as an error. But I expressly represented that march as beginning, not at Winchester, but north of Winchester (p. 211). But grant a slight error of miles here. From Piedmont to Gainesville is twenty-six miles, and by a map furnished me from the bureau of General Gilmer of the Engineers, Gainesville is four miles from Groveton by turnpike. So that the distance to be marched on foot, to get into action, was thirty miles, not thirty-four. Now, General Jackson, on that occasion, marched to Piedmont in one day. Why could not the rest of the troops do the same? They

left Winchester at 12 m. Thursday. The third day brought exactly mid-day of the great battle. The next March, in short days, General Jackson marched his army seventy-five miles in three days, and fought the battle of Kernstown besides. Why could not the remainder of the Army of the Valley march fifty-three miles (General Johnston's measure to Groveton) in three days, when there was no battle to fight by the way? My opinion was, obviously, not grounded on the supposition that the troops were to be allowed to dawdle along the road in a manner which General Jackson's brigade proved to be unnecessary. As to the destitution of food at Piedmont, those who question the fact are respectfully referred to the officers and men of the Thirty-eighth Virginia regiment (for instance). They will receive from them statements which will account very fully for my impression on that subject. No *explanation* of the fact was advanced by me.

4. The next point of General Johnston's criticism is my account of General Beauregard's first plan of action and its relinquishment. If the reader will collate the different paragraphs in which I state that matter (from pp. 213 to 217) he will find that my representation was substantially this: That General B.'s original plan had been to take the aggressive and attack at Centerville, but so few of the troops of General J. had arrived by Saturday night that he was compelled to postpone it; that when the enemy took the initiative, Sunday morning, General B. still recommended the carrying out of so much of that original plan as to advance our right and center on Centerville as soon as the enemy's purpose to direct his main attack on our extreme left was perceived, which suggestion General J. accepted; that corresponding orders for such a movement of the right and center were actually issued, and that they miscarried; that when the fact became apparent that those orders were not executed in sufficient time, the generals *necessarily* relinquished that excellent plan, and wisely contented themselves with bringing up everything within reach for the immediate support of the left. Let the reader now consider the following authorities by which I attempted to guide myself, and I think he will feel that I have committed no serious error, and certainly no intentional one:

General Ewell, then brigadier (whose letter I have before



me), says: "His (B.'s) plan for some time, as explained in frequent interviews with his brigade commanders, had been to move forward his right and center, and attack." Next General B., in his official report, says that at 4:30 a. m. of the 21st (Sunday) he ordered these troops to be in readiness. (Which order General Ewell states he received and observed.) Next, in another part of his report General B. states that he thought an attack by his right wing and center *was the best means of relieving his left*; and that the dispositions were submitted to General Johnston, and the orders issued. Next, a letter from General B. to General Ewell, July 26, 1861, has the following words: "I do not attach the slightest blame to you for the failure of the movement on Centerville, but to the guide, who did not deliver the order to move forward, sent at about 8 o'clock a. m. to General Holmes, and then to you—corresponding in every respect to the one sent to Generals Jones, Longstreet, and Bonham—only their movements were subordinate to yours."

\* \* \* "I am fully aware that you did all that could be expected of you or your command. I merely expressed my regret that my original plan could not be carried into effect, as it would have been a most complete victory with only half the trouble and fighting. The true cause of countermanding your forward movement after you had crossed was that it was *then* too late, as the enemy were about to annihilate our left flank, and had to be met and checked *there*, for otherwise he would have taken us on the flank and rear, and all would have been lost." "N. B.—The order sent you at about 8 a. m. to commence the movement on Centerville was addressed to General Holmes and yourself, as he was to support you; but being nearer Camp Pickens, the headquarters, than Union Mills, where you were, it was to be communicated to him first, and then to you; but he has informed me that it never reached him." Thus wrote General Beauregard to General Ewell five days after the battle. If I understand the points of General Johnston's objections to my rendering of the facts here given, they are these: First. That I err in representing *the giving* of the orders to advance the right and center as occurring when the Yankee attack on the left was developed; whereas, says General Johnston, they were then *countermanded*. (10:30 a. m. is the hour he gives.) And second. That I disparage General Beauregard by representing

him as doing a foolish and ruinous thing, which, had he done it, would have kept six brigades out of the fight, and surely lost the day. Now, the reader should note that it is not I, but General Johnston, who gives 10:30 a. m. as the earliest hour at which headquarters knew where the main Yankee attack was to be. (I, for my part, should not have dreamed of making so disparaging a statement.) I didn't presume to mention the hour. But I represented General B. as still entertaining the purpose of advancing his right and center after it was perceived our left was to be the main point of attack, and as the best means of relieving it. Does not General Beauregard's letter bear me out? General J. says General B. could not have listened for the thunder of his batteries on the heights of Centerville, for none was sent there. Does not General B.'s letter declare that *he thought* he had sent some there? Last, says General J., six brigades would have been kept out of the fight. These six were Holmes's, Ewell's, Early's, Jones's, Longstreet's, and Bonham's. I reply, (5) *five were kept out*. Early's was the only one of the six actually engaged on the left. Holmes's, the only one of the rest which reached the ground, was in position, but did not fire a musket. But take General Johnston's own figures, which show that at half-past 10 o'clock a. m. he learned, at once, that the orders for the advance of the right and center had miscarried, and that the main Yankee attack was on the left. Could not Generals Bonham, Longstreet, Jones, and Ewell, still have marched three miles and a half to Centerville, having been in readiness to do so since half-past 4 a. m.? Jackson held the key to the position on Young's branch until 3 p. m., and certainly received no aid from these brigades.

5. The next, and doubtless the main point with General Johnston, is the opinion advanced by General Jackson and defended by me—that the pursuit should have been pressed, and Washington threatened. General Johnston justifies his cavalry for not pursuing farther, because, says he, “it was *driven back* by the solid resistance of the United States infantry.” In the same paragraph he says: “The infantry was not required to continue the pursuit, because it would have been harrassing it to no purpose. It is well known that infantry unencumbered by baggage trains can easily escape pursuing infantry.” Thus we are told in the same breath that the Yankee infantry was

running so fast that it was useless for the conquering Confederate infantry to fatigue itself by trying to overtake it; and that the Yankee infantry was at the same time standing so staunchly as to beat off Radford's regiment of cavalry, and to make attack by all the Confederate cavalry (J. E. B. Stuart's regiment, etc.) improper. If the Yankees were making so hold a stand, was not that a place for the conquering infantry to strike?

But farther: The Yankee resistance by which Colonel Radford's onset was momentarily arrested (he being temporarily unsupported) was not solid, and should not have put an end to the pursuit. The evidence is in a letter from Colonel Delaware Kemper, of the artillery, now under my eye, which states that "immediately after the repulse of the enemy's final attack he accompanied Colonel Kershaw" (who then was followed by his own and Cash's South Carolina regiment) "in pursuit of the enemy along the turnpike. About dark we arrived within 300 or 400 yards of the suspension bridge over Cub Run, and found the fugitives along the turnpike crowding across the bridge, mingled with the Yankee troops who were retreating by the Sudley road, which intersects the turnpike just west of this bridge. I opened fire upon these masses and elicited no reply; but in a few minutes not a Yankee was within range, all having fled towards Centerville, leaving in our hands fifteen or sixteen pieces of artillery, many wagons, etc." Thus Captain Kemper, pursued beyond the point at which our cavalry was temporarily checked, showing that it should have gone on. With reference to the recalling of infantry from the pursuit to meet an imaginary advance of Yankees on our extreme right, General Johnston simply flouts the whole statement, and says:

"No troops were recalled from the chase, and sent seven or eight miles, by night or day, to meet an imaginary enemy." When the reader considers the following testimony his breath will probably be as nearly taken away by this as mine was. I have under my eye a letter from Colonel R. E. Withers, commanding the Eighteenth Virginia regiment, from which I extract the following words:

"The Eighteenth Virginia was the first regiment which crossed Bull Run in pursuit, Kershaw's Second South Carolina and Cash's Eighth South Carolina following almost immediately. The officers of these (3) three regiments had a rapid con-

sultation, and agreed upon the mode of advance, and speedily put the men in motion, moving by columns of companies on each side of the pike. Before proceeding very far, however, I received, through an officer of General Beauregard's staff, an order of recall, directing me to march my regiment back to the Stone bridge. About the time we reached the bridge another officer rode up, and inquired as to the condition of my regiment and its capacity for further service. My reply was that the men were wearied and hungry, but that the loss of the regiment in battle had not exceeded forty or fifty, and that we were ready to perform any duty which might be deemed necessary. He then told me that 'the General' had just received information that a heavy column of the enemy was advancing in the direction of Union Mills, threatening an attack on Manassas junction, and as all the troops had been withdrawn from that place, it was in great danger. This was just before sunset. We immediately started for Manassas, and pushed forward as rapidly as the exhausted condition of the men would permit. When we reached the 'McLean House,' near Manassas, we were met by orders directing us to go to Camp Walker, on Bull Run a short distance above Union Mills; which place we reached about midnight. The next morning we were ordered back to Manassas, and thence to our former position near Ball's ford, on Bull Run, where we bivouacked in the rain, and remained until Tuesday evening, or Wednesday morning. \* \* \* I presumed that several other regiments received orders similar, as they also were marched back to Manassas, and one or two of them to Camp Walker." So far Colonel Withers. Colonel H. A. Carrington, then of the Eighteenth Virginia, says: "We, after sunset, marched *seven miles* in the direction of our lines on the right, when the rumored advance proved to be unfounded, and the regiment was permitted to rest for the night. The next day, in a drenching rain, we were marched back to the battlefield, and camped on the banks of Bull Run within one-quarter of a mile of the scene of conflict."

With reference to the question of pursuit and of threatening Washington City, let us first consider how far my position extends. On page 236 this is very distinctly defined in the following words: "They (the generals) are not to be condemned by history because they did not take Washington, but because

they didn't try." Even this qualified opinion I should never have presumed to advance before the public on my own judgment or on that of the *amateur* soldiers and newspaper critics, whom General Johnston so justly despises. It was only when I was confirmed in it by the great authority of General Jackson that I ventured to advance it; and my motive was only to defend his credit, after stating, as the truth of history compelled me to do, the fact of his expressing such opinions. It was in May or June, 1862, that, being alone with General Jackson in his quarters, I ventured to mention the general expectation and desire of our troops at Manassas to endeavor at once to improve our victory, and to ask him whether that desire was ignorant and foolish. His brow immediately knit, and striking his little writing table with his hand, he replied: "The neglect of the attempt was a deplorable blunder. Did you know, that on the morning after the battle 10,000 fresh troops reached Manassas, expecting nothing but to be led against the enemy?" I replied:

"I myself saw large arrivals, for I had gone with our wounded from the battlefield to the Junction, and witnessed the coming in of nearly a mile of cars clustered with soldiers like swarming bees, all cheering and shouting, but I did not know how many of them there were." General Jackson said: "Yes, sir, there were ten thousand of them." He then proceeded briefly, but emphatically, to state the leading ideas on which I grounded the discussion in my book. As my word may go for nothing in this matter, I may here say in passing that if any one doubts whether I represent General Jackson's opinion aright herein, he can satisfy himself by resorting to the Hon. Alexander Boteler, to whom General Jackson expressed substantially the same view in July, 1862, at Harrison's landing. General Johnston thinks that had Jackson estimated the policy at Manassas as I represent him, he *could not* have refrained from expostulating. All I can say is, that *I heard him say what I have above stated*. Four days after the battle (he being then under General Johnston's orders), I heard some one ask him the question why the enemy were not pressed? when he replied, with a quiet smile, and a caution which suppressed even the faintest intimation of his private opinion on his countenance, "You will have to ask that of General Johnston." But in 1862

I heard General Jackson, when no longer under his orders, express the strong dissent stated above. I suppose the explanation is to be found in his well known subordination, silence, and modesty towards superiors. And if I have been in error as to the number of fresh troops, the mistake was General Jackson's, and not mine. The same fact may account, in part, for the statement, on page 239, that the Confederate forces had grown in autumn to an aggregate of 60,000. Has General Johnston, after all, denied this? It is not my purpose so much to *argue* the policy of pursuing our victory at first Manassas as to exhibit the supposed evidences of facts claimed in my narrative. But it may be said that if the opinion supported in my book is erroneous, it is an error which is found in very large and very good company. It finds plausibility in the exalted authority of General Jackson. I have never conversed with more than one intelligent Southerner who did not share it with me. It receives countenance from many of high authority among our conquerors. Many readers will recall, for example, the admission of the Yankee Brigadier-General Prentice, captured by General Beauregard at Shiloh, who frankly declared that in failing to improve our victory at Manassas we had lost our opportunity; that the United States had just then reached the temporary limit of their existing munitions and means; that the temper of the nation would probably not have endured farther disaster; but that now all was changed, and our chance had passed away. The common sense of the people, North and South, reasoned that if the Confederates could not (for some reason, whatever it might be) so improve the hour of most brilliant success as to cripple the powers of their adversary for future aggression, then obviously their gallantry must be vain in the end, and must fail before superior numbers. It was this thought which encouraged the North as they recovered from their fright. It was this which filled thoughtful men with foreboding among us. General Johnston points to the failure of the invasions of 1862 and 1863 as proofs that he judged wisely. I point to the fact that Generals Lee and Jackson and the Government judged successes should thus be followed up as proof that the same opinion was not absurd in 1861. I point also to the fact that the invasions of 1862 and 1863 both came very near being successful. The former, ac-

according to the best officers, was only defeated by the straggling of our soldiers. The latter brought the Yankee empire to the verge of ruin, as they very plainly felt at the time. But my chief answer here is that the case of 1861 was wholly different from the two subsequent, and the reasoning from them to it is very much as though one should argue that because in two cases corn planted in November did not thrive, therefore he did right to neglect planting in April. In 1862 and 1863 the Yankees had had time to prepare and to equalize their inferior material to arms by drill and experience. In 1861, when both were inexperienced, was the time for us to employ our superior *morale*. General Johnston, referring to our victories at second Manassas, Frederickshurg, and Chancellorsville, says: "On these occasions the forces defeated were ten times as numerous as those repulsed on the 21st of July, 1861, and their losses twenty times as great." He has told us that McDowell brought 40,000 against him. Does he mean to say that Burnside or Hooker had, either of them, 400,000? McDowell's loss was estimated by General Beauregard at some 4,000. Was Hooker's 80,000? He doubtless uses the words "*defeated*" and "*repulsed*" intentionally. Did Hooker or Burnside retire across the Rapahannock in so much *greater* disorder than McDowell fled to the Potomac? But to the facts: General Johnston declared that the troops could not have been subsisted on the country of the vicinage in an advance on Alexandria, because the army of McDowell, passing over it twice, had doubtless stripped it bare. He forgets that this army was commanded by General Scott, who, recreant as he was to his native land, did not conduct war on savage methods; that he sent out his troops fully supplied for the march; and that their flight was too frightened and rapid for foraging. The fact is, that they left the resources of the vicinage untouched. It was *on my return to Centerville after the battle* that I found a herd of sixty beeves on a farm a mile from the village, which had been precluded from their intended market in Alexandria by the hostilities. And I have the testimony of Colonel Mosby that the neighborhood would then have abundantly supplied a marching army. As to distance, the engineers of the Orange and Alexandria railroad state that Manassas junction is twenty-seven miles from Alexandria. The distance by turnpike is not much dif-

ferent; and the Stone bridge is by that road nearer Alexandria than is the junction. My estimate of the disorganized condition of the Yankee troops after the battle is denied on the authority of the reports of their general officers; and we are told of three divisions unscathed of battle. Let the reader consider if my impressions were not excusable in view of the following facts: First. The public has not yet forgotten the lively descriptions of Mr. Russel, the correspondent of the *London Times*, by whose truthful pictures the Yankees were so intensely mortified. He was surely not a mere heedless, unprofessional relator like me. He had carefully studied, as an eyewitness, the great operations of the Crimean war. Next, I will give some facts which will show the real condition of the Yankee reserves, and of those bodies of their troops which are reported as having retired in so steady and orderly a manner. In a letter from Colonel Del. Kemper, relating to his pursuit above mentioned, are the following words: "I subsequently learned that these troops were under General Burnside, who claimed that they were retiring in good order until the artillery fire above spoken of created the *stampede*, which he did not pretend to deny. Their failure to respond to my fire makes me doubt their previous good order." A mile south of Centerville lived (and I hope still lives) an excellent gentleman named Thomas Stuart, whose Christian hospitalities many a sick and hungry Confederate blessed. He remained on his own premises the whole of Sunday, the 21st. He told me that when the stream of fugitives and vehicles came back, a reserve division of Federal infantry was drawn up across his fields; that as the confusion increased they began to waver; that they were then broken merely by the influence of their own comrades' flight, and about sunset they joined their rout, flying so precipitately as to leave his fields scattered over with knapsacks, etc., in such quantity that on the morrow, he and his servants turning out in the rain, hauled in a granary full of them for the Confederate officers. Yet no armed Confederate had come within cannon shot of these brave reserves. Mr. Stuart was visited by numerous Confederate officers on Monday, and in fact arrested by one of them in a moment of misunderstanding, and rudely carried to the guard-house at Manassas. Is it said such facts were not known at headquarters? I reply by the question:



Ought not headquarters to have been better informed than an obscure person like me? Do not commanders employ efficient scouts? Again, General McDowell, on his return to Centerville, called together his general officers and advised with them. After debate, it was resolved to fall back on the lines of Arlington. But when the generals separated, and went to the places where their several divisions had been ordered to bivouack, they found them all silent and vacant—their troops had come to the same conclusion much more promptly. Again, there was a reserved division advanced to the little village of Germantown, six miles back of Centerville. This body broke at the sight of their fugitive comrades, and concluding that the Confederates, with bloody bayonets, were close behind the crowd, wisely took the road ahead of their brethren, instead of letting them pass and covering their retreat. I quote again from Colonel Kemper: "Soon after the close of the war, I returned to my home in Alexandria, Va., and learned from gentlemen, residents of that city, that no considerable body of men returned to Alexandria from Manassas in a state of organization; and that the garrisons of at least *some* of the forts covering Alexandria and Washington *spiked* their guns in expectation of the coming of the Confederates."

I trust that, with such statements before me, I may be pardoned for believing notwithstanding Yankee assertions, that their army was disorganized.

With reference to the fortifications at Washington, the navigable river, and the ships-of-war, I presume that the expectation entertained by sensible men, who hoped that an attempt would be made to improve our success, was that so lucidly explained as his own by Colonel Mosby. It was, not that we should sit down in Alexandria, to be pelted out by ships-of-war, nor that we should stupidly besiege forts without a siege *apparatus*, but that, remembering the Potomac ceases to be a navigable river *at Washington*, and that the forts on the north and east sides of the city had no existence until afterwards, under McClellan, we should do what Lee and Jackson did in 1862—promptly cross above Washington, avail ourselves of our superiority of cavalry (McDowell had but six companies, almost totally disorganized, at the first collision, July 18th), place ourselves between the city and the routed army and General Pat-

tersen, and effectually interrupt the railroad lines to Washington, while we put ourselves in communication with the Southern party in Baltimore. *It was this* which we hoped to see *attempted*; and we thought that there was enough reason to hope that it would result in the hurried evacuation of Washington, and so, in great political and moral results, to indicate the policy of a prompt and vigorous experiment.

This leads to the question of fact as to the expectation actually prevalent in the army. General Johnston does not "believe that this bombast was really uttered in the army." (The allusion is to the passage on p. 233. The rhetoric I relinquish undefended, as he comes a decorous author at the bar of criticism; and the more cheerfully as it is not my own. The fact is, that *I heard this very simile uttered* by one of the ablest and most enlightened men in Virginia, and connected with the army. It so struck my uncultivated taste that when, long after, the narrative was written it ran off the end of my pen spontaneously.) He was led to believe that our troops thought the war finished, and so went home without leave in crowds. My impression was that the men wished to pursue their success; that the desire to go home was a consequence and not a cause of the inaction which followed. Let the reader see if this impression was not natural, with such testimonies as the following. Colonel Kemper: "In regard to the sentiment of the army on the subject of the failure to pursue our routed enemy, I can speak positively only of my own deep disappointment, but will add my belief that the disappointment was shared by all my acquaintances, and prevailed entirely throughout the army. We had not then learned that the whole duty of an army is to obey orders and ask no questions. The widely-extended disposition to go home, so justly represented by our generals, was, I believe, developed by the conviction which necessarily soon became prevalent that the campaign was ended."

Colonel Robert E. Withers, of the Eighteenth Virginia, writes: "I can only say that so far as I was cognizant of the wishes and expectations of the troops, they certainly anticipated and desired a speedy advance on Washington; and it was only after the lapse of some days, when it was evident that no such advance was contemplated, that the demoralizations and desertions became so troublesome. Such was certainly the case

in our brigade, and I have good reason to believe that the same condition of things existed in other portions of the army. In this connection I will state that I have just had a conversation with Colonel Mosby on this subject, who coincides fully in my opinion, and states that when the cavalry was advanced to Fairfax Courthouse on Tuesday (the second day after the battle), General Elzey's brigade accompanied the cavalry advance, and were in an efficient and serviceable condition, apparently anxious for a rapid advance on Washington. Colonel Mosby also believes that if the entrenchments in front of Washington should have proven too formidable to encounter, no difficulty would have been experienced in compelling the evacuation of the city by a flank movement, crossing the Potomac above Washington, thus interposing our army between Patterson and the city, and with our cavalry occupying the line of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, our great superiority in that arm of the service would have rendered this movement almost certainly successful."

Colonel Carrington says: "My firm conviction is that our army generally favored a prompt and energetic pursuit and improvement of our victory." \* \* \* "The disposition of officers and men to return home was very strong *after* they became satisfied that there would be no onward movement," etc. Thus, also, testifies a letter from Dr. Richard P. Walton, then a surgeon in the field.

One more point remains to be noticed. General Johnston says: "No troops were then encamped in the valley of Bull Run, or nearer to the battlefield than four or five miles. The dead had been buried, so that ladies visited the field without inconvenience."

If the "then" relates to the date of greatest mortality, this may be true. But I was possessed of testimonies which I thought justified me in believing that the opposite was true long enough to do the mischief to the health of the troops. The dead *men* had been buried, but the *horses* had not. The animal remains of Yankee camps, as well as slain men and animals, infected the country for miles.

Then as to the facts: We have seen that Colonel Carrington states the Eighteenth Virginia encamped until Tuesday evening "within quarter of a mile of the scene of the conflict."

Then Cocke's whole brigade was encamped for more than a week at Cub Run bridge, just where the battle ended, in the midst of a painful effluvium. Colonel Carrington says: "Several other brigades besides Cocke's were encamped in the immediate vicinity of the battlefield."

It is perfectly true that after the health of the regiments was infected, many of them were removed to healthier spots. But both the sickness and the mortality continued great. Let such facts as these show the condition of at least a part of the army. The lamented General Charles S. Winder told me in May or June, 1862, that he came to the lines of General Johnston after the battle as Colonel commanding a South Carolina regiment 900 strong. He was directed to stop at Bristoe and encamp at Broad Run. He staid there until the fever had made such ravages that the most he could parade were 300. In the same brigade with the Thirty-eighth Virginia was a North Carolina regiment. In this there were not enough well men to nurse the sick, and details were made from other regiments to help them. The Eighteenth Virginia went to Manassas with 700 bayonets. In August, according to report of the surgeon, it was reduced to ——. It was only once under fire, and the maximum of its loss at that time has been already given in the citation from Colonel Withers.

But it is time that this communication was closed, and I end it with repetitions of respectful consideration for the eminent services, virtues, and position of General J. Two reasons alone have induced me to break that silence in reply to which is usually the most decorous for an author whose published works are subjected to criticism. One is the interest of truth; the other is the interest of the widow and orphan of General Jackson; for I might well fear that the adverse opinion of so eminent an authority as General Joseph E. Johnston would limit, if not wholly arrest, the sale of the work which is designed to aid in relieving these defenseless persons. While, on the one hand, it would be unprincipled in me to seek their pecuniary advantage at the expense of the just fame of General Johnston, or any other; on the other hand, I am sure that he would regret any unintentional injury to the prospects which was not necessary to the defense of truth.

R. L. DABNEY.

# MEMOIR OF A NARRATIVE RECEIVED OF COLONEL JOHN B. BALDWIN,<sup>1</sup>

OF STAUNTON, TOUCHING THE ORIGIN OF THE WAR.

By Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D.

(The following paper from the able pen of Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney will be read with deep interest, and will be found to be a valuable contribution to the history of the origin of the war.

It may be worth while in this connection to recall the fact that when soon after the capture of Fort Sumter and Mr. Lincoln's proclamation, a prominent Northern politician wrote Colonel Baldwin to ask: "What will the Union men of Virginia do now?" he immediately replied: "*There are now no Union men in Virginia.* But those who *were* Union men will stand to their arms, and make a fight which shall go down in history as an illustration of what a brave people can do in defense of their liberties, after having exhausted every means of pacification.")

In March, 1865, being with the army in Petersburg, Virginia, I had the pleasure of meeting Colonel Baldwin at a small entertainment at a friend's house, where he conversed with me some two hours on public affairs. During this time, he detailed to me the history of his private mission, from the Virginia Secession Convention, to Mr. Lincoln in April, 1861. The facts he gave me have struck me, especially since the conquest of the South, as of great importance in a history of the origin of the war. It was my earnest hope that Colonel Baldwin would reduce them into a narrative for publication, and I afterwards took measures to induce him to do so, but I fear without effect. Should it appear that he has left such a narrative, while it will confirm the substantial fidelity of my narrative at second hand, it will also supersede mine, and of this result I should be extremely glad. Surviving friends and political associates of Colonel Baldwin must have heard him narrate the same inter-

1—From *Southern Historical Society Papers*.

esting facts. I would earnestly invoke their recollection of his statements to them, so as to correct me, if in any point I misconceived the author, and to confirm me where I am correct, so that the history may regain, as far as possible, that full certainty of which it is in danger of losing a part by the lamented death of Colonel Baldwin. What I here attempt to do, is to give faithfully, in my own language, what I understood Colonel Baldwin to tell me, according to my best comprehension of it. His narration was eminently perspicuous and impressive.

It should also be premised, that the Virginia Convention, as a body, was not in favor of secession. It was prevalently under the influence of statesmen of the school known as the "Clay-Whig." One of the few original secessionists told me that at first there were but twenty-five members of that opinion, and that they gained no accessions, until they were given them by the usurpations of the Lincoln party. The Convention assembled with a fixed determination to preserve the Union, if forbearance and prudence could do it consistently with the rights of the States. Such, as is well known, were, in the main, Colonel Baldwin's views and purposes.

But Mr. Lincoln's inaugural, with its hints of coercion and usurpation, the utter failure of the "Peace-Congress," and the rejection of Mr. Crittenden's overtures, the refusal to hear the commissioners from Mr. Davis' Government at Montgomery, and the secret arming of the Federal Government for attack, had now produced feverish apprehensions in and out of the Convention. Colonel Baldwin considered Mr. Wm. Ballard Preston, of Montgomery County, as deservedly one of the most influential members of that body. This statesman now began to feel those sentiments, which, soon after, prompted him to move and secure the passage of the resolution to appoint a formal commission of three ambassadors from the Convention to Lincoln's Government, who should communicate the views of Virginia, and demand those of Mr. Lincoln. (That commission consisted of Wm. B. Preston, Alex. H. H. Stuart and Geo. W. Randolph. We will refer to its history in the sequel.) Meantime Mr. Preston, with other original Union men, were feeling thus: "If our voices and votes are to be exerted farther to hold Virginia in the Union, *we must know* what the nature of that Union is to be. We have valued Union, but we are also

Virginians, and we love the Union only as it is based upon the Constitution. If the power of the United States is to be perverted to invade the rights of States and of the people, we would support the Federal Government no farther. And now that the attitude of that Government was so ominous of usurpation, we must know whither it is going, or we can go with it no farther." Mr. Preston especially declared that if he were to become an agent for holding Virginia in the Union to the destruction of her honor, and of the liberty of her people and her sister States, he would rather die than exert that agency.

Meantime Mr. Seward, Lincoln's Secretary of State, sent Allen B. Magruder, Esq., as a confidential messenger to Richmond, to hold an interview with Mr. Janney (President of the Convention), Mr. Stuart, and other influential members, and to urge that one of them should come to Washington, as promptly as possible, to confer with Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Magruder stated that he was authorized by Mr. Seward to say that Fort Sumter would be evacuated on the Friday of the ensuing week, and that the Pawnee would sail on the following Monday for Charleston, to effect the evacuation. Mr. Seward said that secrecy was all important, and while it was extremely desirable that one of them should see Mr. Lincoln, it was equally important that the public should know nothing of the interview. These gentlemen held a conference, and determined that as each of them was well known in Washington by person, the required secrecy could not be preserved if either of them went. They therefore asked Colonel Baldwin to go, furnished with the necessary credentials to Mr. Lincoln. He at first demurred, saying that all his public services had been to Virginia, and that he knew nothing of Washington and the Federal politics, but they replied that this was precisely what qualified him, because his presence there would not excite remark or suspicion. Colonel Baldwin accordingly agreed to the mission, and went with Mr. Magruder the following night, reaching Washington the next morning by the "Acquia Creek route" a little after dawn, and driving direct to the house of Mr. Magruder's brother. (These gentlemen were brothers of General J. B. Magruder, of Virginia.) These prefatory statements prepare the way for Colonel Baldwin's special narrative.

He stated that after breakfasting and attending to his

toilet at the house of Captain Magruder, he went with Mr. A. B. Magruder, in a carriage, with the glasses carefully raised, to Seward, who took charge of Mr. Baldwin, and went direct with him to the White House, reaching it, he thought, not much after nine o'clock a. m. At the door, the man who was acting as usher, or porter, was directed by Colonel Baldwin's companion, to inform the President that a gentleman wished to see him on important business. The man replied, as Colonel Baldwin thought, with an air of negligence, that he would report the application of course, but that it would be useless, because the President was already engaged with very important personages. Some card, or such missive, was given him, and he took it in. He soon returned with a surprised look, and said that the gentleman was to be admitted instantly. Colonel Baldwin accordingly followed him and Mr. Seward into what he presumed was the President's ordinary business room, where he found him in evidently anxious consultation with three or four elderly men, who appeared to wear importance in their aspect. Mr. Seward whispered something to the President, who at once arose with eagerness, and without making any movement to introduce Colonel Baldwin, said bluntly, in substance: "Gentlemen, excuse me, for I must talk with this man at once. Come this way, sir!" (to Colonel Baldwin). He then took him up stairs to quite a different part of the house, and into what was evidently a private sleeping apartment. There was a handsome bed, with bureau and mirror, washstand, etc., and a chair or two. Lincoln closed the door and locked it. He then said: "Well, I suppose this is Colonel Baldwin, of Virginia? I have heard of you a good deal, and am glad to see you. How d' ye, do sir?" Colonel Baldwin presented his note of credential or introduction, which Lincoln read, sitting upon the edge of the bed, and spitting from time to time on the carpet. He then, looking inquiringly at Colonel Baldwin, intimated that he understood he was authorized to state for his friends in the Virginia Convention the real state of opinion and purpose there. Upon Colonel Baldwin's portraying the sentiments which prevailed among the majority there, Lincoln said querulously: "Yes! your Virginia people are good Unionists, but it is always with an if! I don't like that sort of Unionism." Colonel Baldwin firmly and respectfully explained, that in one sense



no freeman could be more than a conditional Union man, for the value of the Union was in that equitable and beneficent Constitution on which it was founded, and if this were lost, "Union" might become but another name for mischievous oppression. He also gave Mr. Lincoln assurances, that the description which he was making of the state of opinion in Virginia, was in perfect candor and fidelity, and that he might rest assured the great body of Virginia, in and out of the Convention, would concur in these views, viz: That although strongly opposed to a presidential election upon a sectional, free-soil platform, which they deplored as most dangerous and unwise, Virginia did not approve of making that, evil as it was, a *casus belli*, or a ground for disrupting the Union. That much as Virginia disapproved it, if Mr. Lincoln would only adhere faithfully to the Constitution and the laws, she would support him just as faithfully as though he were the man of her choice, and would wield her whole moral force to keep the border States in the Union, and to bring back the seven seceded States. But that while much difference of opinion existed on the question, whether the right of secession was a constitutional one, all Virginians were unanimous in believing that no right existed in the Federal Government to coerce a State by force of arms, because it was expressly withheld by the Constitution; that the State of Virginia was unanimously resolved not to assue in the usurpation of that power, as had been declared by unanimous joint resolution of her present Legislature, and by the sovereign Convention now sitting, according to the traditional principles of the State; that if Virginia remained in the Union, the other border States would follow her example, while, if she were driven out, they would probably go with her, and the whole South would be united in irreconcilable hostility to his Government; and that the friends of peace desired to have a guarantee that his policy towards the seven seceded States would be pacific, and would regard their rights as States; without which guarantee the Convention could not keep the people in the Union, even if they would.

Lincoln now showed very plainly that this view was distasteful to him. He intimated that the people of the South were not in earnest in all this. He said that in Washington he was assured that all the resolutions and speeches and declara-

tions of this tenor from the South were but a "game of brag," intended to intimidate the administration party, the ordinary and hollow expedient of politicians; that, in short, when the Government showed its hand, there would "be nothing in it but talk." Colonel Baldwin assured him solemnly that such advisers fatally misunderstood the South, and especially Virginia, and that upon the relinquishment or adoption of the policy of violent coercion, peace or a dreadful war would inevitably turn. Lincoln's native good sense, with Colonel Baldwin's evident sincerity, seemed now to open his eyes to this truth. He slid off the edge of the bed, and began to stalk in his awkward manner across the chamber, in great excitement and perplexity. He clutched his shaggy hair, as though he would jerk out handfuls by the roots; he frowned and contorted his features, exclaiming: "I ought to have known this sooner! You are too late, sir, *too late!* Why did you not come here four days ago, and tell me all this?" turning fiercely upon Colonel Baldwin. He replied: "Why, Mr. President, you did not ask our advice. Besides, as soon as we received permission to tender it, I came by the first train, as fast as steam would bring me." "Yes, but you are too late, I tell you, *too late!*" Colonel Baldwin understood this as a clear intimation that the policy of coercion was determined on, and that within the last four days. He said that he therefore felt impelled, by a solemn sense of duty to his country, to make a final effort for impressing Lincoln with the truth. "Never," said he to me, "did I make a speech on behalf of a client, in jeopardy of his life, with such earnest solemnity and endeavor." "And," he added, "there was no simulated emotions; for when he perceived from Lincoln's hints, and from the workings of his crafty and saturnine countenance, the truculence of his purpose, his own soul was filled with such a sense of the coming miseries of the country, and of the irreparable ruin of the Constitution, that he felt he would willingly lay down his life to avert them." He endeavored to make the President feel that Providence had placed the destiny of the country in his hands, so that he might be forever blessed and venerated as the second Washington—the savior of his country—or execrated as its destroyer. What policy, then, did the Union men of Virginia advise? We believe, answered Colonel Baldwin, that one single step will be

sufficient to paralyze the secession movement, and to make the true friends of the Union masters of the situation. This was a simple proclamation, firmly pledging the new administration to respect the Constitution and laws, and the rights of the States; to repudiate the power of coercing seceded States by force of arms; to rely upon conciliation and enlightened self-interest in the latter to bring them back into the Union, and meantime to leave all questions at issue to be adjudicated by the constitutional tribunals. The obvious ground of this policy was in the fact that it was not the question of free-soil which threatened to rend the country in twain, but a well grounded alarm at the attempted overthrow of the Constitution and liberty, by the usurpation of a power to crush States. The question of free-soil had no such importance in the eyes of the people of the border States, nor even of the seceded States, as to become at once a *casus belli*. But, in the view of all parties in the border States, the claim of coercion had infinite importance. If, as Mr. Lincoln had argued, secession was unconstitutional, coercion was more clearly so. When attempted, it must necessarily take the form of a war of some States against other States. It was thus the death-knell of constitutional Union, and so a thorough revolution of the Federal Government. It was the overthrow of the reserved rights of the States, and these were the only bulwark of the liberty of the people. This, then, was the real cause of alarm at the South, and not the claim of free-soil, unjust as was the latter; hence, all that was necessary to reduce the free-soil controversy to harmless and manageable dimensions, was to reassure the South against the dreaded usurpation of which free-soil threatened to be made the pretext. This, Colonel Baldwin showed, could easily be done by a policy of conciliation, without giving sanction to what Mr. Lincoln's administration chose to regard as the heresy of secession! The Government would still hold the Union and the Constitution as perpetual, and the separate attitude of the seceded States as temporary, while it relied upon moderation, justice, self-interest of the Southern people, and the potent mediation of the border States to terminate it. "Only give this assurance to the country, in a proclamation of five lines," said Colonel Baldwin, "and we pledge ourselves that Virginia (and with her the border States) will stand by you as though you

were our own Washington. So sure am I," he added, "of this, and of the inevitable ruin which will be precipitated by the opposite policy, that I would this day freely consent, if you would let me write those decisive lines, you might cut off my head, were my life my own, the hour after you signed them."

Lincoln seemed impressed by his solemnity, and asked a few questions: "But what am I to do meantime with those men at Montgomery? Am I to let them go on?" "Yes, sir," replied Colonel Baldwin, decisively, "until they can be peaceably brought back." "And open Charleston, etc., as ports of entry, with their ten per cent. tariff. *What, then, would become of my tariff?*" This last question he announced with such emphasis, as showed that in his view it decided the whole matter. He then indicated that the interview was at an end, and dismissed Colonel Baldwin, without promising anything more definite.

In order to confirm the accuracy of my own memory, I have submitted the above narrative to the Honorable A. H. H. Stuart, Colonel Baldwin's neighbor and political associate, and the only surviving member of the commission soon after sent from the Virginia Convention to Washington. In a letter to me, he says: "When Colonel Baldwin returned to Richmond, he reported to the four gentlemen above named, and to Mr. Samuel Price, of Greenbrier, *the substance of his interview with Lincoln substantially as he stated it to you.*"

I asked Colonel Baldwin what was the explanation of this remarkable scene, and especially of Lincoln's perplexity. He replied that the explanation had always appeared to him to be this: When the seven Gulf States had actually seceded, the Lincoln faction were greatly surprised and in great uncertainty what to do; for they had been blind enough to suppose that all Southern opposition to a sectional President had been empty bluster. They were fully aware that neither Constitution nor laws gave them any right to coerce a State to remain in the Union. The whole people, even in the imperious North, knew and recognized this truth. The New York *Tribune*, even, admitted it, violent as it was, and deprecated a Union "pinned together with bayonets." Even General Winfield Scott, the military "Man Friday," of Federal power, advised that the Government should say: "Erring Sisters, go in peace." So strong was

the conviction, even in the Northern mind, that such journals as Harper's *Weekly* and *Monthly*, shrewdly mercenary in their whole aim, were notoriously courting the secession feeling. New York, the financial capital of America, was well known to be opposed to the faction and to coercion. The previous Congress had expired without daring to pass any coercive measures. The administration was not at all certain that the public opinion of the American people could be made to tolerate anything so illegal and mischievous as a war of coercion. (Subsequent events and declarations betrayed also how well the Lincoln faction knew at the time that it was utterly unlawful. For instance: when Lincoln launched into that war, he did not dare to say that he was warring against States, and for the purpose of coercing them into a Federal Union of force. In his proclamation calling for the first seventy-five thousand soldiers, he had deceitfully stated that they were to be used to support the laws, to repossess Federal property and places, and to suppress irregular combinations of individuals pretending to or usurping the powers of State Governments. The same was the tone of all the war speakers and war journals at first. They admitted that a State could not be coerced into the Union; but they held that no State really and legitimately desired to go out, or had gone out—"the great Union-loving majority in the South had been overruled by a factious secession minority, and the Union troops were only to liberate them from that violence, and enable them to declare their unabated love for the Union." No well informed man was, at first, absurd enough to speak of a State as "committing treason" against the confederation, the creature of the States; the measure was always spoken of as "Secession," the actors were "Secessionists," and even their territory was "Secessia." It remained for an ecclesiastical body, pretended representative of the Church of the Prince of Peace, in their ignorant and venomous spirit of persecution, to apply the term "treason" first to the movement in favor of liberty.) The action of the seven States, then, perplexed the Lincoln faction excessively. On the other hand, the greed and spite of the hungry crew, who were now grasping the power and spoils so long passionately craved, could not endure the thought that the prize should thus collapse in their hands. Hence, when the administration assembled at Washington, it probably had

no very definite policy. Seward, who assumed to do the thinking for them, was temporizing. Colonel Baldwin supposed it was the visit, and the terrorizing of the "radical Governors," which had just decided Lincoln to adopt the violent policy. They had especially asserted that the secession of the seven States, and the convening and solemn admonitions of State conventions in the others, formed but a system of bluster, or, in the vulgar phrase of Lincoln, but a "game of brag"; that the Southern States were neither willing nor able to fight for their own cause, being paralyzed by their fear of servile insurrection. Thus they had urged upon Lincoln, that the best way to secure his party triumph was to precipitate a collision. Lincoln had probably committed himself to this policy, without Seward's privity, within the last four days; and the very men whom Colonel Baldwin found in conclave with him were probably intent upon this conspiracy at the time. But when Colonel Baldwin solemnly assured Lincoln that this violent policy would infallibly precipitate the border States into an obstinate war, the natural shrewdness of the latter was sufficient to open his eyes, at least partially, and he saw that his factious counsellors, blinded by hatred and contempt of the South, had reasoned falsely; yet, having just committed himself to them, he had not manliness enough to recede. And above all, the policy urged by Colonel Baldwin would have disappointed the hopes of legislative plunder, by means of inflated tariffs, which were the real aims for which free-soil was the mask.

Thus far Colonel Baldwin's narrative proceeded. The conversation then turned upon the astonishing supineness (or blindness) of the conservatives, so-called, of the North, to the high-handed usurpations of their own rights, perpetrated by Lincoln and Seward, under pretext of subduing the seceded States, such as the suspension of *habeas corpus*, the State prisons, the arrests without indictment, and the martial law imposed, at the beck of the Federal power, in States called by itself "loyal." I asked: "Can it be possible that the Northern people are so ignorant as to have lost the traditionary rudiments of a free government?" His reply was, that he apprehended the Northern mind really cared nothing for liberty; what they desired was only lucrative arrangements with other States.

The correctness of Colonel Baldwin's surmises concerning

the motives of Lincoln's policy receives these two confirmations. After the return of the former to Richmond, the Convention sent the commission, which has been described, composed of Messrs. Wm. B. Preston, A. H. H. Stuart, and Geo. W. Randolph. They were to ascertain definitely what the President's policy was to be. They endeavored to reach Washington in the early part of the week in which Fort Sumter was bombarded, but were delayed by storms and high water, so that they only reached there via Baltimore, Friday, April 12th. They appeared promptly at the White House, and were put off until Saturday for their formal interview, although Lincoln saw them for a short time. On Saturday Lincoln read to them a written answer to the resolutions of Convention laid before him, which was obviously scarcely dry from the pen of a clerk. "This paper," says Mr. Stuart, "was ambiguous and evasive, but in the main professed peaceful intentions." Mr. Stuart, in answer to this paper, spoke freely and at large, "urging forbearance and the evacuation of the forts, etc." Lincoln made the objection that all the goods would be imported through the ports of Charleston, etc., and the sources of revenue dried up. "I remember," says Mr. Stuart, "that he used this homely expression: 'If I do that, what will become of my revenue? I might as well shut up housekeeping at once!' But his declarations were distinctly pacific, and he expressly disclaimed all purpose of war." Mr. Seward and Mr. Bates, Attorney General, also gave Mr. Stuart the same assurances of peace. The next day the commissioners returned to Richmond, and the very train on which they traveled carried Lincoln's proclamation, calling for the seventy-five thousand men to wage a war of coercion. "This proclamation," says Mr. Stuart, "was carefully withheld from us, although it was in print; and we knew nothing of it until Monday morning, when it appeared in the Richmond papers. When I saw it at breakfast, I thought it must be a mischievous hoax; for I could not believe Lincoln guilty of such duplicity. Firmly believing it was a forgery, I wrote a telegram, at the breakfast table of the Exchange Hotel, and sent it to Seward, asking him if it was genuine. Before Seward's reply was received, the Fredericksburg train came in, bringing the Washington papers, containing the proclamation."

The other confirmation of Colonel Baldwin's hypothesis

was presented a few weeks after the end of the war, in a curious interview with a personal friend and apologist of Seward. The first volume of my life of Jackson had been published in London, in which I characterized the shameless lie told by Seward to the commissioners from Montgomery, through Judge Campbell, touching the evacuation of Sumter. This friend and apologist of Seward said that I was unjust to him, because when he promised the evacuation, he designed and thought himself able to fulfill it; but between the making and breaking of the pledge, a total change of policy had been forced upon the administration, against Mr. Seward's advice, "by Thad. Stevens and the radical Governors." Seward, abolitionist, and knave as he was, still retained enough of the statesmanlike traditions of the better days of the republic, to know that coercion was unlawful, and that a war between the States was, of course, the annihilation of the Union. It suited his partisan and selfish designs to talk of an "irrepressible conflict," and to pretend contempt for "effeminate slavocrats"; but he had sense enough to know that the South would make a desperate defense of her rights, and would be a most formidable adversary, if pushed to the wall. Hence, Mr. Seward, with General Scott, had advised a temporizing policy towards the Montgomery government, without violence, and Mr. Lincoln had acceded to their policy. Hence, the promises to Judge Campbell. Meantime, the radical Governors came down, "having great wrath," to terrorize the administration. They spoke in this strain: "Seward cries perpetually that we must not do this, and that, for fear war should result. Seward is shortsighted. War is precisely the thing we should desire. Our party interests have everything to lose by a peaceable settlement of this trouble, and everything to gain by collision. For a generation we have been 'the outs'; now at last we are 'the ins.' While in opposition, it was very well to prate of Constitution, and of rights; but now we are the government, and mean to continue so; and our interest is to have a strong and centralized government. It is high time now that the government were revolutionized and consolidated, and these irksome 'States' rights' wiped out. We need a strong government to dispense much wealth and power to its adherents; we want permanently high tariffs, to make the South tributary to the North; and now these Southern fellows are giving us pre-



cisely the opportunity we want to do all this, and shall Seward sing his silly song of the necessity of avoiding war? War is the very thing we should hail! The Southern men are rash, and now profoundly irritated. Our plan should be, by some artifice, to provoke them to seem to strike the first blow. Then we shall have a pretext with which to unite the now divided North, and make them fly to arms. The Southerners are a braggart, but a cowardly and effeminate set of bullies; we shall easily whip them in three months. But this short war will be, if we are wise, our sufficient occasion. We will use it to destroy slavery, and thus permanently cripple the South. And that is the stronghold of all these ideas of 'limited government' and 'rights of the people.' Crush the South, by abolishing slavery, and we shall have all we want—a consolidated government, an indefinite party ascendancy, and ability to lay on such tariffs and taxes as we please, and aggrandize ourselves and our section!"

These, Mr. Seward's apologist declared to me, were the reasons which, together with their predictions and threats of popular rage, converted Lincoln from the policy of Seward to that of Stevens. Hence the former was compelled to break his promise through Judge Campbell, and to assist in the malignant stratagem by which the South Carolinians were constrained "to fire on the flag." The diabolical success of the artifice is well known.

The importance of this narrative is, that it unmasks the true authors and nature of the bloody war through which we have passed. We see that *the Radicals provoked it, not to preserve, but to destroy the Union.* It demonstrates, effectually, that Virginia and the border States were acting with better faith to preserve the Union than was Lincoln's Cabinet. Colonel Baldwin showed him conclusively that it was not free-soil, evil as that was, which really endangered the Union, but coercion. He showed him that, if coercion were relinquished, Virginia and the border States stood pledged to labor with him for the restoration of Union, and would assuredly be able to effect it. Eight slave-holding border States, with seventeen hireling States, would certainly have wielded sufficient moral and material weight, in the cause of what Lincoln professed to believe the clear truth and right, to reassure and win back the seven

little seceded States, or, if they became hostile, to restrain them. But coercion arraigned fifteen against seventeen in mutually destructive war. Lincoln acknowledged the conclusiveness of this reasoning in the agony of remorse and perplexity, in the writhings and tearings of hair, of which Colonel Baldwin was witness. But what was the decisive weight that turned the scale against peace, and right, and patriotism? It was the interest of a sectional tariff! His single objection, both to the wise advice of Colonel Baldwin and Mr. Stuart, was: "Then what would become of my tariffs?" He was shrewd enough to see that the just and liberal free-trade policy proposed by the Montgomery Government would speedily build up, by the help of the magnificent Southern staples, a beneficent foreign commerce through Confederate ports; that the Northern people, whose lawless and mercenary character he understood, could never be restrained from smuggling across the long open frontier of the Confederacy; that thus the whole country would become habituated to the benefits of free-trade, so that when the schism was healed (as he knew it would be healed in a few years by the policy of Virginia), it would be too late to restore the iniquitous system of sectional plunder by tariffs, which his section so much craved. Hence, when Virginia offered him a safe way to preserve the Union, he preferred to destroy the Union and preserve his tariffs. The war was conceived in duplicity, and brought forth in iniquity.

The calculated treason of Lincoln's Radical advisers is yet more glaring. When their own chosen leader, Seward, avowed that there was no need for war, they deliberately and malignantly practiced to produce war, for the purpose of overthrowing the Constitution and the Union, to rear their own greedy faction upon the ruins. This war, with all its crimes and miseries, was proximately concocted in Washington City, by Northern men, with malice prepense.

## THE TRUE PURPOSE OF THE CIVIL WAR.

---

We all know, that the professed purpose of the war party was to preserve and restore the Union over all the States. But the disclosures made above by Colonel Baldwin of the aims of the head of that party, are sufficient to prove that the real purpose was far other than the pretense:—to enlarge and perpetuate the power of his faction. This had just seized the reins of Federal power by an accident, being in fact but a minority of the American people. This people had condemned it to a righteous exclusion from power for forty years. Its leaders were weary, envious and angry with their long waiting, and hungry for the power and the spoils of office. These cunning men were fully conscious that their tenure of power, won by luck and artifice, would be precarious and brief. The old party of Federal usurpation and centralization had dubbed itself, by a strong misnomer, the Whig party. The people, at ten presidential elections, or congressional issues, had rejected their project. At length, despairing of victory by its old tactics, it had thrown itself into the arms of the later born and despicable party of the Abolitionists, who had at last succeeded in their purpose of raising, in numerous States, their designed tempest of fanaticism. Thus the older and larger party gave itself away to the younger, smaller, and more indecent one; and by this traffic the two had won in November, 1860, an apparent success, so far as to make its leader a minority President. The manipulators well knew their danger from "the sober second thought" of the American people. It was but too probable that the elements of justice and conservatism, unfortunately divided in 1860, would reunite in 1864 to restore the Constitution. Hence, "had they great wrath," because they knew their time was short. They knew that something more must be done to inflame the contest between fanaticism and conservatism, or their glorying would be short.

The hasty secession of South Carolina and the six Gulf States, although justified by the avowed revolutionary section-

alism of the new party in power, gave them their coveted opportunity. The conspirators said to each other: "Now we have our game. We will inflame fanaticism and sectional enmities by the cry of Union and Rebellion, and thus precipitate a war between the States. *Inter armor silent leges.* Our war will be short; for we believe these Southern slavocrats much more boastful than valiant; and, chiefly, we will paralyze their resistance by lighting the fires of servile insurrection, plunder, arson, rape and murder in their rear. But this short war will suffice for us, to centralize Federal power, overthrow the Constitution, fix our high tariffs and plutocratic fiscal system upon the country and secure for ourselves an indefinite tenure of power and riches." Such were precisely the counsels by which such leaders as Senator Pomeroy, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, Governors Morton, Curtin, Andrews, etc., hectored the ignorant and vacillating chief of their party into war, against the advice of real Union men North and South, and especially against the views of his own Premier, William H. Seward. This man, while the most unscrupulous of traffickers, and the chief architect of the new faction, knew well, as did all statesmen and constitutional lawyers, that the Constitution gave the Federal Government, the creature of the Federated States, no right to coerce the seceded States, its own sovereigns and creators. He was older than his supplanters in his own faction, and however unscrupulous, was too much imbued with the precedents, principles and feelings of the older and better days, to bring himself at once to the atrocity of kindling a war between the States; hence, Mr. Seward had adopted the smoother and wiser policy. He had induced his chief to make an ambiguous deliverance in his inaugural, March 4, 1861. He believed that he would be able so to direct the plans of his presidential tool as to make him adhere to the pacific policy. But he was mistaken. The more forward and heady conspirators gathered in Washington, wrested his tool out of his hand, and turned it against him.

These new advisers were aware that a Federal executive had no more constitutional or legal right of his own motion to attack a seceded State, than the poorest constable in the most obscure township. But they were in too much haste to wait for the semblance of authority from a congressional force bill, un-

authorized and flimsy as such a semblance would be. Nor did they feel certain that even their rump Congress would be persuaded to enact a war against sovereign States no longer in the Federation, nor represented in their body, nor subject to their jurisdiction. The Senators and Representatives of seven States would be absent; but those of the great Union-loving Border States, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri and Arkansas, would be present. Such a rump Congress might indeed include a number of the admirers of Andrew Jackson, but they would be too just and clear sighted to claim the precedent of his force bill of 1833 against South Carolina, even though they did not regard it, as true history will, as the mere expression of a tyrannical temper and of personal hatreds in that famous renegade to the principles of the party which elected him. For that force bill was directed against a State which claimed to be still in the Union, while nullifying within her own borders an unjust Federal law. It was wholly another thing for the Federal Government to declare war against seven seceded States, no longer under their authority, but withdrawn from it by sovereign acts more formal and legal than those which had made them parties to the Union. Therefore the conspirators saw that a war must be precipitated without the semblance of law, and against law and the Constitution. By what expedient? By that of an audacious and gigantic lie! They knew that in fact every step and act of self-defense taken by the seceded States had been an act of formal, legal statehood executed by constitutional authorities, the same, to-wit, which had first made those States members of the Federal Union. But they would impudently discard this great fact and call those actions illegal riots, the doings of insurrectionary individuals assembled against the law. They would rely upon the hot arrogance of triumphant fanaticism and the revival of passions which they themselves had "set on fire of hell," to overlook this essential difference. Thus they would seemingly bring this terrible usurpation of their President under the scope of his authority to enforce laws and suppress illegal violence. So he was made to begin his famous war proclamation of April, 1861, which made the most dreadful strife of modern times, with a stupendous false-

hood. On that foul foundation rest all the subsequent crimes of coercion and reconstruction.

That this war was made, not to preserve a constitutional Union, but solely to promote the aims of a faction, is confirmed by these further facts. Its purpose was clearly betrayed by the final reply of Mr. Lincoln to Colonel Baldwin's noble appeal for conciliation: "What, then, will become of my tariff?" He might as well have said out aloud, that he was making this war, not to preserve a Union, but to enforce his projected high tariff. Next, every thoughtful man, North and South, friend or foe of the Union, knew perfectly well that the Montgomery Confederacy of seven States must be short lived if it remained alone without the border States. If I may borrow a new term of finance, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to "freeze out" this weak association. By giving them a useless independence, making them feel the inconveniences of separation, and holding peaceably and steadily before them the benefits and protection of the old, just constitutional Union. So Mr. Seward knew; and on this belief his policy was founded. So the Virginian statesman and ardent lover of the Union, Alexander H. Stewart, assured Mr. Lincoln. So Colonel Baldwin; so ex-Governor Morehead, of Kentucky. My point is then, that the seven seceded States could have been brought back with certainty by pacific means. For the Union, no war was needed. It was made solely in the interest of the Jacobin party.

Secessionists and Union men alike knew that the Montgomery Confederacy could not stand, without the accession of the great border States. But the latter were still firm friends of the Union. They judged, like the secessionists, that the abolition and free-soil movement was sectional, mischievous, insulting, and perilous; but they had calmly resolved not to make it a *casus belli*, wicked as it was. They had distinctly refused to go out of the Union on that issue. They pledged themselves to support Mr. Lincoln loyally and legally, though not the President of their choice, and to conciliate the seceded States provided the crime of coercion was foreborne. But they assured Mr. Lincoln that this usurpation and crime would infallibly drive them, though reluctant, into the secession camp. This made it perfectly plain that peace meant a restored Union, while war meant disunion. But the Jacobins needed a war for

their own factious ends. There was nothing they disliked so much as a Union peaceably restored. Therefore they preferred the tactics which would insure war, and that on the most gigantic scale, rather than peace and union. Their problem was how to make sure of the spilling of blood. Thus while those patriotic and union-loving statesmen, Messrs. Stewart and Baldwin, were pleading with Mr. Lincoln not to coerce, because coercion would precipitate certain disunion and a dreadful war, they were producing upon the cunning and malignant minds of the Jacobin leaders a conclusion exactly opposite to the one they desired. Those minds said to themselves: "Just so; therefore we will coerce, because it is war which we crave, and not a righteous Union."

The history of the peace-congress confirms this explanation. It will stand in all history to the everlasting glory of Virginia, that she proposed this assemblage, as a special agency for harmonizing differences and restoring a true Union. She sent to it her wisest patriots, irrespective of party, headed by the great ex-President, John Tyler, illustrious for his experience, purity, courtesy and fairness. But the Jacobin leaders had resolved that there should be no peace; and this without waiting to see what terms of conciliation might be found. It is a historical fact, that definite instructions went forth from their head in advance, that the efforts of the Peace Congress must be made abortive. The motive was not concealed: that the partisan interests of the Jacobins were adverse to such a peace. Other leaders as Senators Chandler, of Michigan, and Wade, of Ohio, etc., declared with brutal frankness, that the case required blood-letting, instead of peace. Therefore, this last effort of patriotism and love for the Union was an entire failure.

The withdrawal of the seven States from Congress left the Jacobins a full working majority during the months of January and February. They had everything their own way in Congress. But every effort for peace and union made by the patriotic minority, represented by Senator Crittenden, of Kentucky, was systematically repelled. Even when the compromises proposed were transparently worthless to the South, they were refused. The final word of Jacobinism was: "No compromise at all, fair or unfair, but absolute submission, or war and disunion." The utmost pains were taken to teach the bor-

der States and the friends of the Union that they should have no terms save abject submission to such constructions as the Jacobin party might see fit to put upon a rent and outraged Constitution. The proof is complete.

Argument is scarcely needed to demonstrate that the infamous reconstruction measures were taken, not in the interests of a true Union, but of this Jacobin faction. For their architects brutally disdained to conceal their object. For instance, one of their leaders, Alban Tourgee, in his "Fools Errand," expressly declares that the purpose of reconstruction was to elect another Jacobin President, otherwise jeopardized by the reunited Democracy, through the help of the negro suffrage. And he declares that the project was short-sighted, and destined to ultimate failure. Mr. Tourgee has here slandered his brethren. Their reconstruction measures, in their sense of them, were an entire success,—and did just what they designed,—helped them to elect a series of Jacobin Presidents and to fix their parties and policy upon the country. True; those measures placed the noblest white race on earth beneath the heels of a foul minority constructed of a horde of black, semi-barbarous ex-slaves and a gang of white plunderers and renegades. It infected the State governments of the South with corruption and speculation. It injected into suffrage, in the Southern States, a spreading poison, which gives a new impulse to the corruptions of the ballot, already current among themselves, so that the disease is now remediless. But what did the Jacobins care for that? They had gained their end, more Jacobin Presidents, more class legislation, a sure reign for the plutocracy.

According to Mr. Lincoln's theory, a State could not go out of the Union, and any act of secession is *ipso facto* void and null, being but the deed of an illegal riot, and not of a legal body. Hence all the States were legally in the Union throughout and after the war. Hence, when armed resistance ended, nothing was necessary to reinstate the so-called seceding commonwealths in their full Federal status, except their submission to the chastisements and the changes laid down for them by the will of their conquerors. The subjugated States had all made that submission humbly and absolutely. Nothing should have been wanting, therefore, to reinstate them, except the



witness of the Chief Executive of these facts. That witness had been borne expressly and fully by General Grant himself and the President.

Mr. Lincoln's man Friday, Andrew Johnson, now President by the accident of murder, continued to stand precisely upon his master's avowed platform. Why not? The whole coercion party professed to stand on it! The war had been fought through upon that pretended platform. Why should not Andrew Johnson simply reinstate these chastened sisters in the Union, by his executive action especially, seeing they had never been out of it, could not be out of it, and had fully accepted their chastisement? But that simple course meant the following result: *The war Democrats of the North, rallying the Southern people to themselves, would elect a Democratic President!* There is the whole *rationale* and cause of the infamy and treason of reconstruction. And this explanation stamps the whole war, with all its butcheries and miseries as a gigantic lie; and this result has given a perfect justification to every measure of resistance taken by the States assailed. Such was the final judgment of that Union-lover and reluctant Confederate, that great Christian soldier, Robert E. Lee, as he went down with stately yet tragic steps, towards the tomb and the judgment bar of the omniscient and holy God, in whom he believed.

Victoria, Texas, Dec., 1896.

## THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.<sup>1</sup>

Young gentlemen of the Eumenean and Philanthropic Societies: I am here to-day in response not only to your call, but to an imperative sentiment. This is the sense of the value of the young men of the South, and their claims upon every patriot. When I remember how your class has lately striven and died for us—how this seat of learning, like every other shrine of the Muses, was emptied at the call of a bleeding country, I feel that you have earned a claim upon our sympathies and aid, which cannot be refused. Nor was this devotion of our youth the less admirable—in my eyes it is only the more touching—because it has pleased the divine disposer, in his mysterious and awful providence, to deny you that success which you hoped. It has pleased Heaven that you should be so disappointed of your deserved victory, as that fools should say you have bled in vain.

But be assured, that as the afflicted child is ever dearest to the mother's heart, your disasters only cause your country to press you closer to her bosom. Amid her cruel losses, her children alone remain her last, as her most precious possession; and it is only from their energies, their virtues, their fortitude under obloquy and oppression, that she hopes for restoration. We assuredly believe, young gentlemen, that no drop of blood, generously shed in the right, ever wets our mother earth in vain.

The vision of the harvest from this precious seed may tarry, but in the end it will not fail; and we wait for it. The holy struggle may meet with seeming overthrow. But if our immediate hope is denied, amidst the manifold alternatives of Almighty Providence, some other recompense is provided, which will gladden and satisfy the hearts of our children, if not ours, in God's own time and place.

Now that this expectation may not fail, it is needful that you cherish jealously, the virtues and principles which ennoble

---

1.—Commencement Oration before the students of Davidson College, June, 1868,  
108

your cause. Your steadfast and undebauched hearts must be the nurturing soil to preserve the precious seed of martyr blood, during this winter of disaster, to the appointed summer of its resurrection. The urgency, the solemnity of this season of darkness and danger, warn me that it is no mere literary pastime, but a high and serious duty which should occupy this hour. Pardon me, then, for passing to a topic which is fundamental, at once to the dearest hopes, of your country, and of its dead heroes. I would employ this season of communion with my young fellow-citizens, in uttering my earnest warning to them, of a danger and a duty arising out of the misfortunes of our country—a danger most portentous to a thoughtful mind, a duty peculiarly incumbent on educated men.

*This danger may be expressed by the fearful force of conquest and despotism to degrade the spirit of the victims. The correlated duty is that of anxiously preserving our integrity and self-respect.* A graphic English traveller in the East, describes the contrast, so striking to us, between the cowering spirit of the Orientals, and the manly independence of the citizens of free States in Western Europe. These have been raised in commonwealths which avouch and protect the rights of individuals. They are accustomed to claim their chartered liberties as an inviolable heritage. The injuries of power are met by them, with moral indignation and the high purpose of resistance.

But the abject Syrian or Copt is affected no otherwise by Turkish oppressions than by the incursions of nature's resistless forces: the whirlwind or the thunderbolt.

The only emotion excited is that of passive terror. He accepts the foulest wrong as his destiny, and almost his right. He has no other thought than to crouch, and disarm the lash by his submissiveness. And if any sentiment than that of helpless panic, is excited, it is rather admiration of superior power than righteous resentment against wrong. He who is the most ruthless among his masters is in his abject view the greatest.

When we remember the ancestry of these Orientals, we ask with wonder what has wrought this change? These are the children of those Egyptians who under Sesostris, pushed their conquests from Thrace to furthest Ind, beyond the utmost march of Alexander and who, under the Pharaohs, so long con-

tested the empire of the world with the Assyrian. Or they are the descendants of the conquering Saracens, who in later ages made all Europe tremble. Or these Jews who now kiss the sword that slays them are the posterity of the heroes who, under the Macabees, wrested their country from Antiochus, against odds even more fearful than Southern soldiers were wont to breast. Whence, then, the change?

The answer is, this mournful degeneracy is the result of ages of despotism. These base children of noble sires are but living examples of the rule, that not only the agents, but the victims of unrighteous oppression, are usually degraded by their unavenged wrongs: a law which our times renders so significant to us.

Illustrations of the same rule also may be found in the more familiar scenes of domestic life. Few observing men can live to middle life without witnessing sad instances of it. We recall, for instance, some nuptial scene, from the distance of a score of years. We remember how the bridegroom led his adored prize to the altar, elate with proud affection. We recall the modest, trembling happiness of the bride, as she confidently pledged away her heart, her all, to the chosen man whom she trusted with an almost religious faith. Her step, diffident yet proud, the proprieties of her tasteful dress, her spotless purity of person, her sparkling eyes, all bespoke self-respect, aspiration, high hope, and noble love. They revealed the thoughts of generous devotion with which her gentle breast was filled.

Had one whispered at that hour, that the trusted man would one day make a brutal use of the power she now so confidently gave, she would have resented it as the foulest libel on humanity. Had the prophet added, that she was destined to submit, tamely and basely, to such brutality, she would have repudiated this prediction also with scorn as an equal libel on herself. But we pass over a score of years. We find the same woman sitting in an untidy cabin, with a brood of squalid, neglected children around her knees; her shoulders scantily covered with tawdry calico, her once shining hair now wound like a wisp of hay into a foul knot. She is without aspiration, without hope, without self-respect, almost without shame. What is the explanation? She has been for years a drunkard's wife.

She was wholly innocent of her husband's fall. Long has she endured unprovoked tyranny and abuse. Not seldom has she been the helpless victim of blows from the hand which was sworn to cherish her. Often has she meditated escape from her degrading yoke; but the unanswerable plea of her helpless children arrested her always. She has found herself tied to a bondage where there was neither escape or resistance; and these wrongs, this misery, has at last crushed her down into the degraded woman we see. The truthfulness of this picture will only be denied by those who judge from romance without experience, not from facts.

We need only to look a little at the operations of moral causes on man's nature to find the solution of these cases. We are creatures of imitation and habit. Familiarity with any object accustoms us to its lineaments. The effect of this acquaintanceship to reconcile us to vice, has been expressed by Pope in words too trite to need citation. And the fact that one is the injured object of repeated crimes does not exempt him from this law, but, as will be shown, only subjects him the more surely to it. Not only is every act of oppression a crime, but the seasons of despotism are usually eras of profuse and outbreaking crime. The baleful shadow of the tyrant's throne is the favorite haunt of every unclean bird and beast. And if the oppressing power be the many-headed monster, a tyrant faction, this is only more emphatically true. At such a time the moral atmosphere is foul with evil example. The vision of conscience is darkened and warped. The very air is unhealthy even for the innocent soul.

For the common mind the standard of rectitude is almost overthrown in the guilty confusion. But this is the consideration of least weight. A more momentous one is found in the law of man's sensibilities. The natural reflex of injury or assault upon us is resentment. This instinctive emotion has evidently been designed by our Creator, as the protector of man in this world of injustice. Its function is to energize his powers for self defense. But its nature is active; in exertion is its life. Closely connected with this is the sentiment of moral disapprobation for the wrong character of the act.

This emotion is the necessary correlative to approbation for the right: so that the former cannot be blunted without

equally blunting the latter. The man who has ceased to feel moral indignation for wrong has ceased to feel the claims of virtue. Nor is there a valid reason for your insensibility to evil, in the fact that you yourself are the object of it.

Now when a man is made the helpless victim of frequent wrongs when his misfortunes allow him nothing but passive endurance, resentment and moral indignation give place to simple fear. And this by two sure causes; not only is the very power of sensibility worn away by these repeated and violent abrasions; not only is the nature dulled by the perpetual violences to which it is subjected, but that activity being denied, which is the necessary scope of these sentiments of resistance, they are extinguished in their birth. The soul which first rose against injustice with the quick and keen sense of wrong, and heroic self-defense; at last brutalized by its very injuries, subsides into dull indifference or abject panic. Should it not make the thoughtful patriot shudder to compare the present temper of the people with that of the revolutionary sires, who bequeathed to us the liberties we have forfeited? With how quick and sensitive a jealousy, with what generous disdain did they spurn at the imposition of a tax of a few pence, against their rights as Englishmen; while we seek to reconcile ourselves with a jest or sophism to wrongs a thousand fold as onerous. In the words of Burke, "In other countries the people judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance; here they anticipated the evil, and judged of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augured misgovernment at a distance, and snuffed the reproach of tyranny in every tainted breeze." But we, their miserable children, are compelled to inhabit the very miasm and stench of extreme oppression, until our tainted nostrils almost refuse the office, and leave us unconscious, while stifled by the pollution.

We need not go so far to find this startling contrast; we have only to compare our present selves with ourselves a few years ago to find fearful illustrations of the working of these influences. Let us suppose that on the evening of July 21, 1861, I had stood before that panting citizen soldiery, which had just hurled back the onset of our gigantic foe, and that I had denounced to them that seven short years would find them tamely

acquiescing in the unutterable wrongs since heaped upon us: in the insolent violation of every belligerent right, in the sack of their homes, in the insult of their females, in the treacherous arming of their own slaves, in their subjection to them; with what anger and incredulity would they not have repelled me? Let us suppose that I had made the imputation that some day they would consent to survive such infamy: that it would be possible for them to make any other election than that of death, with their faces to the foe, rather than such a fate; would they not have declared it a libel upon the glories of that day, and upon the dead heroes, even then lying with their faces to the sky? But we have consented to live under all this, and are even now persuading ourselves to submit to yet more! Do you remember that unutterable swelling of indignation aroused in us by the first rumor of outrage to Southern women? How that you felt your breasts must rend with anguish unless it were solaced by some deeds of defense and righteous retribution? But we have since had so illstarred a tuition by a multitude of more monstrous wrongs, that the slavish pulse is now scarcely quickened by the story of the foulest iniquities heaped upon a defenseless people. Thus does our own melancholy experience verify the reasonings given.

But, my hearers, this deterioration of the moral sensibilities does not place man above the promptings of selfishness: it rather subjects him more fully to them. We may not expect that the sense of helplessness and fear will reconcile him to suffer with passive fortitude, without a struggle. As well might we look to see the panting stag bear the bit and spur with quietude. The instinct of self-preservation goads the oppressed to attempt some evasion from their miseries; but their only remaining means is that common weapon of the weak against the strong—artifice. Every down-trodden people is impelled almost irresistibly to seek escape from the injustice which can no longer be resisted by force, through the agency of concealments, of duplicity, of lies, of perjuries. The government of the oppressor is therefore a school to train its victims in all the arts of chicanery and meanness. Mark, I pray you, the cruel alternative to which it shuts them up. They must suffer without human help or remedy, evils unrighteous, relentless, almost intolerable; evils which outrage at once their well-being and

their moral sense; or they must yield to temptation and seek deceitful methods of escape. And the only motives to move them to elect suffering rather than dishonor are the power of conscience, the fear of God, and faith in the eventual awards of His justice. What portion of any people may be expected to persevere in this passive heroism without other support?

In answering this question we must not forget the inexpressible seductiveness and plausibility of that temptation. It pleads with the injured victim of wrong, that his oppressors had no moral right to inflict these evils: That their injustice and treachery forfeit all claim upon his conscience: That to deceive them is but paying them as they deserve in their own coin. An embittered hatred, which pleads its excuse from a thousand unprovoked injuries, impels the sufferer by a sting as keen as living fire, to seek the revenge of deception: the only one in his reach. And last, the specious maxim, "That necessity knows no law," completes the triumph of the temptation with the plea, that the endurance of this tyrant's unmitigated will is impossible, and therefore the case justifies the means of evasion.

Now I need hardly pause, before this assembly, to say that all this pretended argument is a guilty sophism. You know that, however plausible it may be, it is grounded in a profane forgetfulness of God, of his holy will, and of his omnipotent government over oppressors and oppressed. You see how it involves that maxim of delusion, of whose advocates the Apostle declared "their damnation is just"; that the end sanctifies the means. At the day when God shall bring him into judgment, no man will dare to obtrude these specious pleas, for his violation of the eternal principles of truth and right—principles on which repose the welfare of all creatures and the honor of God, principles whose sanctity only finds illustrations in the very evils which man experiences from their breach. But none the less do we find anticipations of seduction verified by ten thousand lamentable lapses from honor among our suffering people: in their tampering with ensnaring and oppressive oaths; in the evasion of pecuniary obligations; in the deceitful avowal of pretenses abhorrent at once to the political pride and principles of our country. The facts are too melancholy to be pursued.

Meantime the efficiency of all these seductions is made



more fearful by the causes which hedge our young men up from wholesome activities. There is no longer a career for their individual energies. Scarcely any profession offers a prize worthy of their exertions. If they turn to agriculture, or the pursuits of the merchant or artisan, the ruin of trade and the crushing burden of unequal taxation compel them to labor for a pittance. Hence the danger that they will succumb to an apathetic despair. We see too many of our youth whose fortitude should sustain a fainting, sinking country, sitting down in skeptical doubt to question the control of Divine Providence, or sinking into an indolence which they persuade themselves is inevitable, and seeking a degrading solace in epicurean ease. Take heed, gentlemen, lest these insidious discouragements transmute the sons of the heroes of Manassas and Shiloh, as the despotism of arbitrary rulers has charge, into the modern Roman. In the Eternal city we see the descendants of that race which gave laws and civilization to a conquered world, now in the words of their own sensual poet, "*Porci de grege Epicuri, cute bene curata,*" filling their idleness with the criticism of cooks and singing women. Rather than risk the yielding to this, arise and go forth, sturdy exiles, to carve out a new career on some more propitious soil.

It has been made my duty by my appointed pursuits to examine the history of previous conquests; and it is my deliberate conviction that no civilized people have ever been subjected to an ordeal of oppression so charged as ours with all the elements of degradation. I have explained how the unrighteousness of the despotism becomes a potent influence for temptation. We experience a domination, the iniquity of which is declared by every patriot of every previous party, and constantly avowed by the very men that impose it up to the day, when their reason was swept away by the torrent of revenge and the lust of domination. Our people have been violently thrust down from the proudest ancestral traditions, and highest freedom boasted by any commonwealth on earth, to the deepest humiliations and most grinding exactions. They have been overpowered, not by manly force, but by filthy lucre, which bribed the proletarians of the whole world to crush us. We stooped our banners, not like the conquered Gaul and Briton to one who knew how, *debellare superbos, forcere victis*; but to a rabble who are not ashamed to

confess that their fourfold numbers and tenfold resources were unable to subdue us, until they had armed against us all the mercenaries of Europe and our own poor slaves besides. And to crown all, the favorite project is to subject us, not to the conqueror only, but to these alien serfs, to be invested with our plundered franchises. Thus are our people robbed not only of their possessions and rights, but of their dearest point of honor. Now, every one experienced of human nature knows that when you break down the chosen point of honor, the man is degraded to a brute unless he is sustained by the vital grace of God. Thus it appears that the influences and temptations by which conquest depraves its victims are now applied to our people in their most malignant efficacy. The lesson which we should learn from this fact is that we should be watchful in an equal degree to preserve our own rectitude and honor.

For, young gentlemen, as the true dishonor of defeat lies only in this deterioration of spirit, so it is the direst wrong which the injustice of the conqueror can inflict. A brave people may, for a time, be overpowered by brute force, and be neither dishonored nor destroyed. Its life is not in the outward organization of its institutions. It may be stripped of these and clothe itself in some diverse garb, in which it may resume its growth. But if the spirit of independence and honor be lost among the people, this is the death of the common weal: a death on which there waits no resurrection. Dread, then, this degradation of spirit as worse than defeat, than subjugation, than poverty, than hardship, than prison, than death.

The law on which I have commented has ever appeared to me the most awful and obscure of all those which regulate the divine providence over men and nations. That the ruthless wrong-doer should be depraved in his own soul by his crimes, that he should find a part of his just penalty in the disorders and remorse infused in his own nature by his acts; this is a dispensation as adorably righteous as it is terrible. But that not only guilty agent, but guiltless victim should, by a law, almost natural, find his moral being broken down; that a necessity which his will had no agency in procuring should subject his heart to an ordeal so usually disastrous:—this is indeed fearful. “Clouds and darkness” here surround him. Yet “justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne.” One thing I clearly

infer hence, that he has ordained the virtuous man's life in this wicked world, to be often a battle, in which he may be called "to resist unto blood, striving against sin." We learn from these mournful histories how it may be our duty to surrender life, rather than conscience and moral independence. Man's first duty to himself is the preservation of his own virtue. His prime duty to his God may be said to be the same. For how shall the depraved creature fulfill that "chief end," glorifying God? With no little seeming then was it argued of old, that a dishonored life was no life indeed; so that the imposition of unavoidable degradation of soul was equivalent to the Maker's decree dismissing us out of the scene of defiled existence. Here is the most plausible excuse of that antique self-sacrifice, by which the heroic souls of the Pagan world claimed the privilege of escaping subjugation, and defying the oppressor by a voluntary grave. For they knew not the only power by which the inward stain of oppression can be countervailed. They had never heard of gospel grace; of regeneration and adoption; of a hope anchored beyond the grave; of a reward in glory ennobling all suffering and endurance for conscience sake. Let us not, however, palliate the error of those who thus retired from life's battle without the word of supreme command of the Captain. But from this danger of the soul's subjugation along with that of the body, we may infer the duty and privilege of preferring the surrender of life to the desertion of duty. It is yours, young gentlemen, to boast among the alumni of your college, more than one illustrious instance of this fate, which may prove so enviable compared with ours. First among these, I am reminded of one, whose youthful face, then ruddy as that of the hero of Bethlehem, is filed in the memories of my first visit here, General Ramseur. Nowhere, in the rich record of Southern chivalry, can there be found the name of one who more deliberately resolved for death rather than forfeiture of duty and honor. Twice within a few weeks, at Winchester and Fisher's Hill, his command had yielded to numbers, in spite of his most strenuous and daring exertion. On the morning of the battle of Belle Plain, which began so gloriously for the Confederates, while marshalling his troops for the strife, he exhorted them to stand to their colors, and calmly declared that if they had any value for his life they would henceforward be

staunch; for he was resolved never to participate with them in another flight from their foes. It was with this deliberate purpose he joined battle. But as the bravest are ever the most gentle, this stern resolve did not exclude the thought of the domestic tie, which his country's call had sundered almost as soon as it was bound around his heart, and of the infant which had never received its father's kiss. His courage was only reinforced by these remembrances. For, as he began the onset, in the second movement of the tragedy, he exclaimed to the officers near him, "Now, gentlemen, let us so fight to-day as to finish this campaign; I want to see my first born." After performing his whole duty during the changeful day, he saw all the line upon his left giving way. With his own command he strove to stem the torrent of enemies; and when they, too, broke in panic he refused to flee with them, but busied himself in rallying a few determined spirits like himself. When the last fugitive left the field they saw him with a handful, breasting the whole pursuing host, until, according to his pledge, he fell with his face to the foe. Let this example inspire you to *endure* as he *fought*, and you will be secure against all the degradations of defeat.

This degradation, then, does not necessarily accompany our prostrate condition. Divine Providence often makes the furnace of persecution the place of cleansing for individual saints. Why may it not be so for a Christian people? Why may not a race of men come forth from their trials, like the gold seven times refined in the fire, with their pride chastened, and yet their virtues purified? This can be from the only cause which sanctifies the sufferings of the Christian, the inworkings of the grace of God. Nothing is more true than that the natural effect of mere pain is not to purify, but to harden the sinful heart of man, exasperating at once its evils and its miseries. The cleansing Word and Spirit of God alone interpret its sufferings to it and convert them into healthful medicines of its faults. So it is the power of true Christianity, and that alone, which can minister to us as a people the wholesome uses of adversity. The salvation of the life of the Southern society must be found by taking the Word of God as our constant guide. But it may be asked: To what course of action should this spirit of unyielding integrity prompt us? The answer from

those infallible oracles is easy. While you refrain from the suggestion of revenge and despair, and give place as of necessity to inexorable force, resolve to abate nothing, to concede nothing of righteous conviction. Truckle to no falsehood and conceal no true principle; but ever assert *the right* with such means of endurance, self-sacrifice and passive fortitude as the dispensation of Providence has left you. If wholesale wrongs must be perpetrated, if wholesale rights must be trampled on, let our assailants do the whole work and incur the whole guilt. Resolve that no losses, nor threats, nor penalties, shall ever make you yield one jot or tittle of the true or just in principle, or submit to personal dishonor. And let us remember, young gentlemen, that while events, the success of ruthless power, the overthrow of innocence may greatly modify the *expedient*, they have no concern whatever in determining the *right*. The death of a beloved child may determine its mother to bury its decaying body out of sight, even to hide in the wintry earth that which before she cherished in her bosom; but its death will never make the true mother repudiate its relation of paternity to it, or deny its memory, or to acquiesce in any slander upon its filial loveliness. You must decide, then, each one for himself, what things must be conceded to the necessities of new events, and what things must be disclaimed as contaminating to the unconquered soul. May I not safely advise, that, in making these decisions you should always refer them to that standard of judgment which we held before our disasters, as the truer, and worthier one; rather than to that standard to which we are seduced by their humiliations? Judge then from the same principles (however new their special applications) from which you would have judged in happier years when your souls were inspired by the glorious traditions of your free forefathers, and saw the truth in the clear light of your conscious manhood; not as men would have you judge, from hearts debauched by defeat, and clouded with shame and despair.

We are a beaten, conquered people, gentlemen, and yet if we are true to ourselves, we have no cause for humiliation, however much for deep sorrow. It is only the atheist who adopts success as the criterion of right. It is not a new thing in the history of men that God appoints to the brave and true the stern task of contending and falling in a righteous quarrel.

Would you find the grandest of all names upon the roll of time? You must seek them among this "noble army of martyrs," whose faith in God and the right was stronger than death and defeat. Let the besotted fools say that our dead have fallen in a "lost cause." Let abandoned defamers and pulpit buffoons say that theirs are "dishonored graves." I see them lie in their glory with an illustrious company: with the magnanimous Prince Jonathan, on Mount Gilboa, and the good king Josiah in the vale of Megiddo; with Demosthenes and Philopoemen; with Hannibal, the pillar of Carthage; with Brutus and Cato; with the British Queen, Boadicea; with the Teuton Herman; with Harold, the Saxon, on Hastings field; with Wallace, with Kosciusko; with one grander than all, our own Jackson. We have no need, sirs, to be ashamed of our dead; let us see to it that they be not ashamed of us. They have won the happier fate, "taken away from the evil to come, they have entered into peace; they rest in their beds, each one walking in their uprightness." To us they have bequeathed the sterner trial of asserting, by our unshaken fortitude under overthrow, the principles which they baptized with their blood. Let the same spirit which nerved them to do, nerve us to endure for the right; and they will not disdain our companionship on the rolls of fame. Before I end, let me invoke the aid of the gentler sex, whose sympathizing presence I see gracing our solemnities. The high mission of woman in society has been often and justly argued. But never before was the welfare of a people so dependent on their mothers, wives and sisters, as now and here. I freely declare that under God my chief hope for my prostrate country is in their women. Early in the war, when the stream of our noblest blood began to flow so liberally in battle, I said to an honored citizen of my State, that it was so uniformly our best men who were made the sacrifice there was reason to fear that the staple and pith of the people of the South would be permanently depreciated. His reply was: "There is no danger of this while the women of the South are what they are. Be assured the mothers will not permit the offspring of such martyrs to depreciate."

But since, this river of generous blood, has swelled into a flood. What is worse, the remnant of the survivors, few, subjugated, disheartened, almost despairing and, alas, dishonored,

because they have not disdained life, on such terms as are left us; are subjected to every influence from without, which can be malignantly devised to sap the foundations of their manhood and degrade them into fit materials for slaves. If our women do not sustain them they will sink. Unless the spirits which rule and cheer their homes can reanimate their self-respect, confirm their resolve, and sustain their personal honor, they will at length become the base serfs their enemies desire. Outside their homes, everything conspires to depress, to tempt, to seduce them. Do they advert to their business affairs? They see before them only loss, embarrassment, and prospective destitution. To the politics of their country? They witness a scheme of domination and mercenary subserviency where the sacrifice of honor is the uniform condition of success. Only within their homes is there, beneath the skies, one ray of light or warmth to prevent their freezing into despair.

*There*, in your homes, is your domain. *There you* rule with the sceptre of affection, and not our conquerors. We beseech you, wield that gentle empire in behalf of the principles, the patriotism, the religion, which we inherited from our mothers. Teach our ruder sex that only by a deathless love to these can woman's dear love be deserved or won. Him who is true to these crown with your favor. Let the wretch who betrays them be exiled forever from the paradise of your arms. Then shall we be saved, saved from a degradation fouler than the grave. Be it yours to nurse with more than a vestal's watchfulness, the sacred flame of our virtue now so smothered. Your task is unobtrusive; it is performed in the privacy of home, and by the gentle touches of daily love. But it is the noblest work which mortal can perform, for it furnishes the polished stones, with which the temple of our liberties must be repaired. We have seen men building a lofty pile of sculptured marble, where columns with polished shafts pointed to the skies, and domes reared their arches on high, like mimic heavens. They swung the massive blocks into their places on the walls with cranes and cables, with shout and outcries, and hugh creaking of the ponderous machinery. But these were not the true artisans: they were but rude laborers. The true artists, whose priceless cunning was to give immortal beauty to the pile, and teach the dead stones to breathe majesty and grace were not there. None

saw or heard their labors. In distant and quiet workrooms, where no eye watched them, and no shout gave signal of their motions, they plied their patient chisels slowly with gentle touches, evoking the forms of beauty which lay hid in the blocks before them. Such is your work; the home and fireside are the scenes of your industry. But the materials which you shape are the souls of men, which are to compose the fabric of our church and state. The politician, the professional man, is but the cheap, rude, day laborer, who moves and lifts the finished block to its place. You are the true artists, who endue it with fitness and beauty; and therefore yours is the nobler task.



## THE UNITED STATES AS A MILITARY NATION<sup>1</sup>

Art. VI.—1. *Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1860.*

By Jos. C. G. Kennedy, Superintendent. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1862.

2. *Message from the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress*, at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Thirty-eighth Congress; with the Reports of the Heads of Departments, and Selections from accompanying Documents. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1864.

The ability of a people for military exploits depends, in modern times, upon two classes of circumstances, the material and the moral. Among the former, the most important are, the numbers of its population, the magnitude of its revenues, its manufactures, commerce, and agriculture, and its geographical position. The moral qualities which make a military nation are, natural bravery, love of glory, intelligence, independence, fortitude, and, above all, virtue and devout religious faith.

The authors and politicians of the North usually point, with much exultation, to the war against the Confederate States, which closed in 1865, as a splendid proof of their military prowess. Since that triumph, it has been customary with them to claim that the United States stand in the first rank, if not at the head of the great military powers of Christendom; and that they may safely venture to cope with the greatest of those powers. That war is supposed to prove that the United States are able, with ease, to place a million of combatants in the field, and a powerful navy upon the water, for any contest which affects the national heart. We propose to bring this boast to the test, by a review of some facts and figures, touching the parties to the recent war. We hope thus to reach a correct estimate of the real material resources of the United States for a great war, at this time, and of the aptitude which

---

1—Appeared in *Southern Review*, Baltimore, Oct., 1869

the Northern people have disclosed for military enterprises.

The first consideration is obviously a comparison of the population and production of the two parties to the late contest. According to the census of 1860 (the year before the contest began), as prepared by the North itself, the Northern States and territories had then a population of twenty-two million eight hundred and seventy-seven thousand (22,877,000). This aggregate includes a few hundreds of thousands of negroes, but none of the Indian tribes. The Confederate States had a population of eight million seven hundred and thirty-three thousand (8,733,000). But of these, three million six hundred and sixty-four thousand (3,664,000) were negroes; so that if they are deducted, we have only five million (5,000,000) whites to sustain the struggle against twenty-two million, (22,000,000). Northern politicians are bound to admit the fairness of at least such a deduction; because they uniformly say that slavery is a weakening institution, inimical to national strength. We, indeed always argued (what this war abundantly confirmed) that a slave-holding nation was stronger for war than a hired-labor State, of numbers equal to the free and slave together; because the devotion of the bondmen to productive labor both released a large number of freemen for military employments, and gave them a higher tone. But the Northern statesman cannot use this plea; because he has always denied these facts, and asserted the contrary. He is therefore obliged to count out the Southern slaves, and to compare the belligerents as five million (5,000,000) against twenty-two million (22,000,000). He is obliged, also, to estimate these five million (5,000,000) as a people far inferior to the rest of Christendom, in their *morale*; for has he not proved to his own satisfaction, in his descants on the 'barbarism of slavery,' that this institution invariably renders the masters lazy, effeminate, selfish, petulant, and insubordinate? The case which we have to inspect is, therefore, for the North, this: that twenty two millions (22,000,000) of the best people in Christendom managed somehow to beat five millions (5,000,000) of the meanest.

In this estimate of numbers, we have not counted Kentucky or Missouri as Confederate States. Both parties claimed them; the North actually possessed them, during the whole war, with their territories, resources, and population. A few thousand

from each State preferred exile to subjugation, and enlisted in the Confederate armies. These, with the recruits from Maryland, were far more than counterbalanced by the large defections from the Confederate cause in East Tennessee, Northern Arkansas, Western North Carolina, and Northwestern Virginia.

But we have not yet reached the fair comparison of material strength. The campaigns of 1861 were only tentative; the real "tug of war" had not yet come. But before May, 1862, the Northern armies were in permanent occupancy of all Western and Middle Tennessee, of nearly the whole of Louisiana, of parts of Florida, of the coast of South and North Carolina, of Eastern and Northern Virginia. This occupation continued until the end of the war. The population thus excluded from the support of the Confederate cause cannot be exactly estimated; but it was certainly more than twelve hundred thousand (1,200,000). Thus the Confederates bore all the real brunt of the struggle, with three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000) white people. The fighting men were not absolutely limited to this source, for some of them came from within the hostile lines; but, of course, no material resources, and few men, could be relied on from a territory in the permanent occupancy of the enemy. The real problem which was solved, then, was, how twenty-two million (22,000,000) of the best people in Christendom managed, in three years, to beat three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000) of the meanest.

But the material resources were even more unequal than the numbers. The Confederate States were rather planting than agricultural communities; their customary industry produced rather those things which are the basis of Northern commerce, than the wheat, the beef, the wool, the horses, which sustain large armies. The North had far the larger portion of the commerce and manufacturing arts. It retained the national army, navy, arsenals, treasury, government. The South had all these to create, in the progress of the struggle.

But, *secondly*, it is pleaded that a people inhabiting a large country, have, in their forests, rivers, mountains, and especially in the distances which armies must pass over, a defense against the invader, which almost compensates for any inferiority of

force. This argument was not true, in the case of the Confederate people. New circumstances, with their geographical position, wholly neutralized these advantages. Of these, one was the advantage which the invader had of railroads; by which he almost annihilated distance, and overcame weight and bulk, in transporting the *materiel* of war. The Confederate States were sufficiently supplied with railroads for all the military purposes of the invader. Retreating armies usually attempted, of course, to dismantle these roads; but the repair of any damage thus hastily done, was easy and quick work to a numerous people, abounding in industrious mechanics, and in machinery and materials. Thus, as an invading army was enabled by its military successes to advance, the captured railroads in its rear, quickly repaired, and easily defended, brought its base of operations practically up to its rear. It was, thus, relieved of this, formerly, the great difficulty of extended invasion.

The decisive circumstance which robbed the South of the defensive advantages of its wide territory was, the superiority of its enemies upon the water. The North retained the use of the whole national navy. While the South was chiefly a planting community, the North was manufacturing and maritime. Hence the multiplication of ships and sailors, which continued and increased her naval superiority, was easy and rapid for her. This cause also enabled her, by her blockade, to exclude the Confederates from all foreign sources of supply. The navigable water was therefore, all, the territory of the North. The ocean, and the gulf, which bounded two sides of the Confederate States, belonged to their invaders, furnishing them a cheap and swift way of approach, secure from assault. This fact rendered the whole sea and gulf shores bases of operations for Federal armies. It made all an exposed frontier, and brought the enemy upon it all, as though he had embraced these two sides, as he did the other two, with conterminous territories of his own. The reader may represent to himself the significance of this fact, by imagining the inland kingdom of Bavaria assailed at once on four sides, by Austria, Switzerland, and the German States, all united under a single will. The professional soldier will comprehend the disastrous position of the invaded country, when he considers that the invader thus had two pairs of bases of operations, at right angles to

each other; whence it resulted that from whatever interior base a Confederate army might set out to defend its frontier, its line of operations must needs be exposed, parallel to one of these Federal bases, and liable to be struck at right angles, by a force advancing from it.

But, worse than this, the Confederate territories were penetrated, in nearly every part, by navigable rivers, opening either into the sea, which was the territory of the North, or into the Northern frontier. On the east, the Potomac, the Rappahannock, the York, the James, the Roanoke, the Neuse, the Cape Fear, the Savannah, and on the south, the St. John's, the Alabama, the Brazos, stretched their navigable waters far into the interior; while the Mississippi, which is itself an inland sea, floating the greatest war-ships, passed out of the United States below Cairo, through the midst of the Confederacy, to the Gulf, which, again, belonged to its enemies. The Tennessee and the Cumberland, with their mouths opening upon the Northern frontier, in winter navigable for war-ships, as well as transports, curved inwards, near the heart of the Eastern quarter. The Arkansas and Red rivers opened the States west of the Mississippi. The difficulties of invasion were also unexpectedly removed, for the North, by the new decision given to the question, whether shore-batteries could command a channel against ships of war. Military authorities had usually answered this question in the affirmative. The answer was now reversed in favor of the North. When ships were only of wood, and propelled only by winds, a motive power gentle (except when it assumes the unmanageable violence of the tempest), variable, and uncertain, artillerists might well boast that shore-batteries would usually destroy the ships opposed to them. But when the ship has within itself an unfailing motive power, as steady as the breeze and as swift as the tempest, and when it is coated with an iron plating, which, if not absolutely impervious to cannon-shot, at least delays for a long time the ruin of the framework, all is changed; it may expect to brave the bullets of shore-batteries with impunity, and to pass them without the trouble of silencing them. Thus, the forts designed to protect New Orleans, Memphis, and Vicksburg, were, in each case, passed by the Federal steamers without being reduced; and that which they were designed to defend was seized in spite of

them; so that their retention became useless or impracticable.

Now the naval supremacy of the North having been asserted upon all these streams, it was the least part of the evil, that all their fertile valleys were exposed to ravage, and the wealthy cities on their banks, to capture. Each of the rivers became a new and secure base of operations for invading armies. Difficulties of distance were almost annihilated. No interior base from which Confederate armies could operate toward their own frontiers, to extrude the invader, remained secure from attack from one or another of these rivers. Hence it was, that defensive victories were usually fruitless of permanent results.

The justice of this view is sustained by the fact that *all the rivers were opened to the ingress of Northern armies and fleets* (save a small portion of the Mississippi between Vicksburg and Port Hudson) without much difficulty, and before the real "tug of war" began. By May, 1862, they were all occupied; and the illusory advantages of territory and distance for the invaded, were all lost. The extent of the Confederate territory no longer interposed any difficulty to the invaders, except the demand for a plenty of money and mechanics.

The *third* subject of comparison is, obviously, the size of the armaments which the rivals were able to put into the field. To appreciate the amazing disproportion, the reader must ponder a few figures. According to the report of the Adjutant General of the United States, two million five hundred and thirty thousand (2,530,000) soldiers were employed by land, during the course of the war. The whole population of the North subject to military duty, but not in service, had also been enrolled, and the number was found to be two million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand (2,784,000). These facts reveal the curious result (of which use will be made hereafter), that, had no foreigners been employed in their armies, the North would have had, on land, nearly half (2,530,000 against 2,784,000) of their whole male population of military age, actually under arms. But the actual strength of their armies, at the close of the war, is very accurately fixed by the returns of volunteers mustered out of service. These were one million thirty-four thousand (1,034,000). So that, adding the regular army, we find that they employed, at one time, one million seventy-two thousand five hundred (1,072,500) combatants, on land, "to crush the

rebellion." Thus, something more than one doughty warrior to every four white Confederate souls (including all the soldiers, old men, sick, women, children, babies, and cowards), and at least one fighting man to every two Confederate souls adhering in any sense to that government during the whole of the last year of the war, were required to conquer their resistance! This vast host was served by one horse or mule for every two men in the field; and it destroyed draught animals at the average rate of five hundred (500) per day. It was ministered to by one thousand and eighty (1,080) sea and river transports, at a daily cost of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars (\$120,000) for their navigation alone. It was furnished during the war with nearly eight thousand (8,000) cannons, and nearly twelve millions (12,000,000) of small arms; while the masses of cartridges, shot, shell, and gunpowder were fabulous.

To the efforts of this Xerxean host must be added those of the navy of the United States. This arm employed, in the course of the war, one hundred and twenty-six thousand five hundred and fifty-three (126,553) sailors and marines; besides the countless mechanics and servants about the naval arsenals and *depots*. The Report of the Secretary, under date of December 5, 1864, gives the following "General exhibit of the navy, including vessels under construction," to-wit:

No.	Guns.	Tons.
113 Screw steamers especially constructed for naval purposes .....	1,426	169,231
52 Paddle-wheel steamers especially constructed for naval purposes .....	524	51,878
71 Iron-clad vessels .....	275	80,596
149 Screw steamers, purchased, captured, etc., fitted for naval purposes .....	614	60,380
174 Paddle-wheel steamers, purchased, captured, etc., fitted for naval purposes.....	921	78,762
112 Sailing vessels of all classes.....	850	69,549
<hr/>		
671 Total .....	4,610	510,396
588 Total navy, December, 1863.....	4,443	467,967
<hr/>		
83 Actual increase for the year.....	167	42,429

Now against these, place the following numbers of the Con-

federate armies. The aggregate of all the levies made during the whole war, was about equal to the available force present for duty at one time with their enemies; that is to say, about six hundred and sixty thousand (660,000), or one-fourth the whole number enlisted by the North during the war. If we estimated the Confederate force effective for duty at any one time by this *ratio* we should give them less than one hundred and twenty-five thousand (125,000) soldiers in actual service, the day their armies were strongest. When we remember that many of their levies were from districts soon occupied permanently by their enemies, to which therefore no provost-marshal could ever go to reclaim absentees, we might reasonably conclude that the number of Confederates actually in the field at any one time bore a still smaller ratio to the total of levies. But the superiority of the Confederate administration, with the higher patriotism of the people, wonderfully counterpoised this disadvantage, and enabled the government to present, in May, 1864, about two hundred and sixty-four thousand (264,000) combatants to Mr. Lincoln's nine hundred and seventy thousand (970,000), the number he had under arms at that time. But it was impossible for the Confederacy to mobilize, for campaigning, as large a *ratio* as their enemy did. They had the same length of frontier to guard; they were therefore compelled to reserve for garrisons and posts a far larger part relatively to their whole force. Hence, while General Grant, as commander-in-chief, was able to put in the field, for aggressive purposes, six hundred and twenty thousand (620,000) men in May, 1864, Mr. Davis opposed him with about one hundred and twenty-five thousand (125,000) in the several active armies.

The disproportion of forces, and the relative character of the rival armies, may also be illustrated by the numbers actually arrayed against each other in several battles. At the critical turn of the first battle of Manassas, the official reports of Generals McDowell and Beauregard show that the decisive grapple for the key of the battle-field was made by six thousand five hundred (6,500) Confederates against twenty thousand (20,000) United States troops, including several regiments of regulars. The Confederates won it. At Sharpsburg, thirty-three thousand (33,000) Confederates repulsed ninety thousand (90,000) Federalists. At Chancellorsville, thirty-five thousand (35,000) Confed-



erates beat Gen. Hooker, with the "finest army upon the planet." In the Wilderness, Gen. Lee met Gen. Grant's one hundred and forty-two thousand (142,000) with fifty thousand (50,000) and without any accessions to this number, continued to breast the Federal army increased (save as the Confederate shot had thinned it) by sixty thousand (60,000) more. In the battle of Winchester, in the autumn of 1864, Sheridan only won a dearly bought victory from Gen. Early, by hurling fifty thousand (50,000) upon his twelve thousand (12,000.) In the closing struggle Gen. Lee's thirty-three thousand (33,000) were not dislodged from Petersburg and Richmond until their assailants were again increased to one hundred and eighty thousand (180,000.) And finally, the remnant of Lee's heroic army did not surrender to this enormous host until it was reduced to less than eight thousand (8,000) muskets. The aggregate of men paroled at Appomattox was made up of some twenty or more thousand (20,000) stragglers, and men on detached service, who came in, to avail themselves of the supposed pacification, after the termination of military operations.

To this disparity of forces upon land, and overwhelming superiority upon the water, must be added the advantages derived by the North from their blockade. This crippled the Confederacy, both in its military and in its financial efforts. The true basis for credit, upon which alone the "sinews of war" could have been borrowed in Europe (where alone they existed for the new government) was in the Southern cotton and tobacco. Mr. Davis's administration should have had not only the large and precious crop of 1860, but an equal crop in 1861, and successive ones in 1862 and 1863, only diminished in bulk, but enhanced in price, upon which to found, at once, a system of foreign loans, and an all-persuading motive for foreign recognition. Only in 1864, did the stress of domestic wants become so urgent as to arrest all other tillage, for the production of provisions. Now the blockade never wholly arrested shipments of cotton; but it gradually became stringent enough to impose upon them a tax in the form of losses by capture, or of bribes to Federal officials, sufficient to disappoint effectually these great purposes. The financial right arm of the Confederacy was tied up. Again, the blockade imposed such difficulties upon importations that, although they continued almost to the

last, they were limited to a few of the more compact articles which nurtured the war; and these were supplied in the most scanty and inadequate degree. Thus, the weaker combatant was kept, in a measure, unarmed and unfed, during the unequal struggle.

*Fourthly.* To give a correct estimate of Northern prowess in this war, the truth must be told—which is not pleasant to the pride of the Confederates—that their armies, apart from their deficient numbers, were never formidable in their character. The Confederate glory was dependent more on the weakness of their assailants, than on the intrinsic vigor of their defense. This assertion, true though distasteful, will be substantiated by these two facts: first, that the people of the South were never roused to what professional soldiers call a popular resistance; and secondly, that the government never had a really organized and disciplined army. As to the first, their enemies did indeed wage their war in a ruthless way, which gave abundant motive and justification for popular warfare; that is, for turning every male of the invaded country into a soldier without the formality of enlistment, and for teaching him to regard every invader as an outlaw, to be assailed by any means, and in every place. But the Southern people never availed themselves of that right. Amidst all the unutterable horrors of the raids, the burnings, the wanton and ruinous ravagings, the home people of the South maintained a singular neutrality, and submitted with an unaccountable quiescence, leaving all defense and vengeance, alike, to the organized soldiery. Federal officials came and went along vast lines of transportation; cavalymen who had given the country people every reason to regard and treat them as wolves, traversed the regions they had desolated; bummers rode away with their spoil, secure from ambuscade unless some movable column of the regular Confederate armies, under some Morgan, Quantrel, or Mosby, happened to be near. The citizens—plundered, ravaged, murdered—rarely avenged themselves by becoming *guerillas*.

This singular quietude of a spirited people was to be accounted for by several causes. Perhaps the most operative of these was the quixotry of the government; which, in its eager desire for the reputation of a civilized and honorable belliger-

ent, uniformly neglected and discouraged such citizens as proposed to resort to those rights of nature which the outrages of the invaders justified. The people, moreover, were strangers to war and bloodshed. Two generations of profound peace at home, had made ease pleasant, and personal vengeance abhorrent to their habits. Their character was quiet, law-abiding, kindly, in the highest degree. Their high civilization, and the standard of material comfort and safety to which they were accustomed, had disqualified them for seeking the rough and turbulent vengeance of the *guerilla*. And then, the men of hardihood and spirit had responded at first to the call of their country, and were in the regular armies. So it was, that the Northern invader was almost wholly free from that species of annoyance which, when combined with the resistance of organized armies, becomes so terrible—popular warfare.

Next, when we asserted that the armies of the Confederacy, inadequate in size as they were, never showed themselves truly good armies in quality, we did not impugn the gallantry of the bulk of the men composing them. *The morale* *ə'doəd v jo* is a thing of comparative estimate. It may be very true (as this discussion will evince) that, compared with that of the North, the *morale* of the Confederacy was lofty and brilliant. But it must be confessed that, compared with the historic standard, the Confederate people and soldiery were not, as a whole, a heroic body. The war found them in a transition state. Very many, perhaps the most of the reputable men (with nearly all the women) still cherished the hardy virtues and ennobling spirit of Revolutionary grandsires. Yet the corrupting copartnership with the North had continued just a generation too long. The leaven of a sensualistic morality and civilization was at work all through the South; the contagion had already tainted multitudes. Hence, although in the moment of first enthusiasm the people seemed to rally almost as one man to the call of liberty raised by the undebauched spirits, yet when the stress of danger and toil came, many proved themselves craven. The Confederate armies certainly included a class of patriot soldiers the noblest which this age can produce, under any clime. This class was numerous; it embraced, perhaps at all stages of the war, a majority of the levies. But there was also a large element of baser metal; men who begrudged their sacrifices for

liberty, and shirked danger. And as death thinned the ranks of the original armies, this worse material became relatively larger.

But the fact, that the Confederacy never had a really good army, can be explained abundantly, without depreciating the gallantry of the Confederate people. It never had the leisure, nor the skilled officers, to organize a thorough army. The population, though gallant, was ignorant of war, by reason of two generations of peace. The fewest men are born soldiers, like the Jacksons, the Ashbys, the Sterling Prices, the Forrests. For ordinary mortals, it is a hard and long lesson, to learn that untiring self-denial, that devotion to duty, that study of detail, that carefulness, that self-government, that talent of command, that intelligence in the arts of attack and defense, which must be added to personal courage, to make the good officer. Nothing can teach that lesson to them, except long experience in actual service. Now the Confederacy was compelled to organize into armies a larger portion of its men than any modern nation has been able to keep in the field. It was obliged to employ thousands of officers, where it had only a few score — the graduates of West Point, and veterans of the little army of Mexico—competent. There was not in the country a tithe of the practical knowledge of military duties which was necessary to organize and instruct the armies raised. That so much was done, to approximate such bodies of unwarlike men towards the character of regular armies, shows an extraordinary gallantry and aptitude for war, in the Southern people. But the armies never had enough competent officers to make them, as wholes, well drilled or well organized forces. At the beginning of the campaigns of 1862, they had more nearly attained this character: thenceforward, while individuals acquired the experience and hardihood of veterans, the regiments gradually lost their regularity of movements, and tactics were more and more at a discount. Southern officers and soldiers uniformly testified that the drill of the Northern regiments (except when confused by attack) was better than their own. But the Northern army must have been but a sorry standard of comparison in this particular, since they had a part of the same difficulties to overcome in extemporizing their forces. The most experienced Southern officers confessed that it was the

rarest spectacle to see their advancing regiments preserve such an *alignment* in their onset as to deliver anything like a collective shock again the enemy. Usually, the onset was the rush of an impetuous mob, in which the quick men were one or two hundred yards in advance of the slow. It was the testimony of the soldiers, that the front line, if supported by a second line of battle in the rear, must always make its account, when fired into by the enemy, to receive also at least a partial fire from their own friends; because no Confederates were ever sufficiently under the control of their officers, to hear Northern bullets whistle, without returning them. In the best Confederate regiments, during the excitement of battle, eager suggestions from privates were as loud, and as influential, as commands from their officers.

This lack of drill was the necessary result, not only of a deficiency of officers, but also of the cruelty of the emergency. Troops must needs be hurried to the front before their training was completed; often, before it was begun. Cavalry horses were taken from pasture or plough to-day, and employed in action to-morrow. Recruits were sent to the front the day they were enrolled, and were merged at once in active forces, whose exacting duties in the march, the picket, and the line of battle, left them not one moment for drill, during a whole half year. Troops ceased to go into winter quarters; for the campaigns extended through winter and summer alike. The very lack of instruction and drill necessitated a four-fold exposure of the efficient officers; so that the army was at length almost wholly deprived of its more capable and experienced leaders, by death or capture. And, to crown all, the government had laid a foundation for defective discipline, by making the officers elective. From all these causes it came to pass that the Confederate armies, while displaying great gallantry on the part of a majority of their men, had scarcely enough discipline and drill to entitle them to the name of regular armies. This deficiency was confessed by the highest possible authority, that of Gen. Lee himself. This consummate soldier, speaking of the advantage of perfect drill and unity of action, and declaring that he believed this advantage so great, as against either of the forces then engaged, as to be almost incapable of exaggeration, pointed to it as the natural remedy for his inferiority

of numbers. But then, pausing, he added, with accents of significant sadness: "But I cannot give this drill to my army, because the enemy has my officers in his prisons."

The Federal authorities were exempt, in the task of forming their armies, from the most of these difficulties. They had, first, the whole standing army of the United States, as a nucleus and model for their military crystallization. They had the major part of the instructed officers. They were able to draw mercenary officers from all the armies of Europe. They, as the aggressors, could choose their own time for the initiative, and needed not to move their new armies until they thought them ready, while the defendants must, perforce, move to meet them, prepared or unprepared. And especially, the invaders, having their own populous country and all the world to furnish numbers, were able to keep their new levies in the *depots*, until they were drilled. It was easy for them to have enough men at the front, and enough also in the camps of instruction.

The work which the North had to do, therefore, was only to beat forces of one-fourth their own number, or less; and these untrained to war. They should have found the Confederate armies almost as little formidable in their quality as in their size.

*Fifthly.* The credit of the North for this exploit must also be affected by this fact, that while they had at the outset twenty-two millions (22,000,000) against five millions (5,000,000), and during the real crisis of the war, twenty-two millions (22,000,000) against three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000), they did not deem these odds sufficient, but eagerly sought the aid of the rest of the world. They believed themselves, if we may infer from their actions, unable to crush this feeble adversary, without drawing from the Southern slaves armies as large as all those of the Confederacy, and from Europe hundreds of thousands of her proletaries. The Federal Secretary of War tells us that he mustered out of service about one hundred and seventy thousand (170,000) negro combatants. These were recruited almost exclusively from the slaves of their enemies. When Gen. McClellan, during the Presidential canvass of 1864, ashamed of so savage and disgraceful a dependence, promised that he, if made President, would disband the negro troops, Lincoln himself ridiculed his

promise; saying that this would deprive the Union cause of the aid of two hundred thousand (200,000) men, and would thus render its success hopeless. That is to say, the head of the Federal Union judged that its twenty-two millions (22,000,000), backed by all the mercenaries of Europe, would be unable to conquer these three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000) Confederates, without the aid of two hundred thousand (200,000) partially reclaimed, black savages!

It would, perhaps, be hard to find documentary *data*, from which to learn the exact number of foreign recruits in the Northern armies. We can show that this element was very large. All well-informed persons know that every country of Western Europe was canvassed by "emigration-agents," who, under this thin disguise, were recruiting officers for the North; and that a large part of that human stream, which flows annually into the United States, was, during the war, directed into the Union armies. Not only were foreigners found in every regiment; whole brigades, as that of Meagher, and even divisions, as that of Blenker, were composed exclusively of Irish men or of Germans. In the prison *depots* of the Confederates, half, at least, of the captives gave evidence of foreign birth. The Secretary of War at Washington gives us the nationalities of fifteen thousand seven hundred (15,700) men buried in the military *Golgotha* of that capital. Of these, he tells us, four thousand nine hundred (4,900) were native white soldiers, four thousand one hundred and eighty (4,180) were negroes, and six thousand six hundred (6,600) were foreign-born. Either the native-born must have been more chary of exposure to wounds and disease, than the foreign-born; or else, in the armies which sent their disabled men to Washington, there must have been more foreigners than native whites in the ratio of nearly seven to five. Once more. The reports of the war and navy departments of the Washington Government show an aggregate of two million six hundred and fifty-six thousand (2,656,000) men, actually engaged, at different times, in the military and naval service of the war. But the whole number of men capable of military duty, in the "loyal" States, who had not been drafted, was two million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand (2,784,000.) Whence, if those States had done their own fighting, it would follow that nearly half their men must

have been for a time in service. But the uniform testimony of travelers and citizens was, that the walks of civil life in the North exhibited a very slight depletion of their customary throngs. While, in the South, every assemblage, at church, at the seats of justice, in the streets of towns which were not military posts, gave striking evidence of the absence of nearly all the arms-bearing men, at the North, a very small part of the home population was absent in the camps. Now, the only solution of this riddle is, that their levies were filled chiefly with foreigners. Putting these data together, it seems very plain that less than half in the Northern armies were native citizens. In other words, these twenty-two million (22,000,000), after recruiting their armies with two hundred thousand (200,000) negroes, were not able to conquer the three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000), until they had associated with them half a million of foreigners. The North found it necessary to call all the world to its help, in order to overpower its feeble adversary!

But, *sixthly*, the whole story is not yet told. Even this whole people, with the negroes and all the world to back them, acknowledged themselves unable to subdue the resistance of their little foe, by any ordinary methods of warfare recognized among civilized nations. They were compelled to add to these the most ingenious combination of savage and illegitimate expedients, to undermine the adversary whom they could not meet in fair and equal battle. One of these was the incarceration of unarmed citizens, captured in the pursuits of civil life, who might perchance either become Confederate soldiers afterwards, or might aid some soldier or soldier's family with their industry. Another was the exclusion by blockade of medicines for the sick; a barbarity unheard of before among polite nations. The calculation was, that the stroke of cold steel or disease, in the body of the gallant adversary, might be aggravated unto death in the more instances; and that the pestilence might ravage the home population, unchecked by the skill of the physician. Another was the destruction of food and the implements of industry, among the peaceful citizens of the South. It was cunningly calculated, that by these means, some brave enemies at the front might be recalled home by the harrowing news of famine at their beloved hearth-



stones, or that, at least, their arms might be paralyzed by the anguish; and that some others might be starved out by lack of rations. What did it matter that helpless women, little children, old men who had shed their blood for the flag of the United States, the poor negroes, innocent in every sense, of the war, might perish of the dire but undeserved doom of famine? No matter, if there was a chance thereby of weakening some of those few brave arms, which they so much dreaded in battle. History will never disclose the ruthless and universal diligence of the North in this work of destruction. It was for this it needed its million (1,000,000) of destroyers. Its only hope was to make the dearth as wide as the hostile country. Its politicians boasted with an amiable wit, that if the prowess of neither Gen. McClellan, nor Burnside, nor Hooker, nor Grant, could prevail to "crush the rebellion," they had enlisted one, more all-conquering than the whole of them, *general* starvation. Scarcely a county in the interior of the largest Southern State escaped this systematic ravage. Wherever the Northern troops went, work-animals were stolen or slaughtered, with all other live stock; all ploughs and other implements of husbandry broken; mills and factories burned; tanneries destroyed, with their hides; and the blessed bread, sacred gift of divine Providence to man, either burned or trampled under the horses' feet. The sweeping ravages of Sheridan, in Virginia, under the express orders of the commander-in-chief, and of Sherman in South Carolina and Georgia, will never be forgotten while history has a verdict to utter. The flatterers of these men boasted that the desolation was to be so utter that the crow flying across the wastes would be compelled to carry his own rations! And if it was not so complete, the only reason was, that the industry of even Northern malice wearied of the work of destruction.

These methods, and not the Federal arms, were, in truth, the weapons which wrought the ruin of the Confederacy. Its little armies never were beaten; they were, in fact, dispersed by the difficulties of subsistence. They did not yield to the force of arms, but to the efficacy of these savage and cowardly means.

One more artifice of barbarism remained, by which the gigantic enemy could supplement his lack of prowess; the violation of the *cartle* for the exchange of prisoners. As soon as

the Washington Government came to understand the task it had undertaken, and to perceive its advantage in wearing out the adversary which it could not meet in a fair field, it began to seek pretexts for evading its own engagements for this exchange. Ultimately, it came to act upon the policy of holding every dreaded Confederate, whom it captured. It mattered not to it, that a larger number of its own men were left to pine or die in captivity. At last, when, early in 1865, the arguments or the frank concessions of the Confederate Government had removed the last pretext for delaying the general exchange, "Butler the Beast" was selected by the Federal Generalissimo, as a fitting tool, to write a letter so insolent, and so unworthy of a soldier, that it was calculated all intercourse must, perforce, be interrupted, and thus, the doors of the prisons be finally closed upon the captured Confederates, until their aid would be too late for their cause. "The Beast," disgraced a little after by his master, expressly disclosed this design! And the commander-in-chief, with equal candor, declared, that if the fifty thousand (50,000) Confederate soldiers, whom he held, were released, and added to the armies of their country, its conquest would be impossible. He manifestly counted it for nothing, that this exchange would restore to his ranks fifty thousand (50,000) of his own braves! This, he felt, would be no equivalent; the conquest of that number of Confederates would require an addition of three hundred thousand (300,000) negroes, or mercenaries, or native Northerners.

Here, then, is the exploit of the Northern people; that twenty-two million (22,000,000), possessed of every material advantage, aided by two hundred thousand (200,000) negroes filched from the South, and by all the mercenary adventurers of the world besides, were able to overpower three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000), after three years, and after they had added to all the legitimate appliances of civilized war, all the savage expedients of bad faith, ravage, sack, and disease. In the sober light of these facts and figures, the claim of prowess for the North, in this war, is infinitely preposterous. That it did not crush its puny antagonist within the first six months, is subject of burning reproach. That it admitted itself unable to crush him at all single-handed, and was compelled to invoke

the aid of all Europe, of the poor negro, of savage artifice, and barbarities long discarded by civilized man; this should make it silent forever, as to the glories of this war. It is, for it, the most mortifying exhibition of national impotency, which modern history discloses, anywhere this side of China.

But still it is pleaded, that if the North failed to display signal prowess in the field, it did nevertheless carry through this great war with spirit and determination; and did actually overcome, somehow, a great resistance. Even European observers, ignorant of facts, seem to admit that, if for nothing else, the North is to be dreaded for its perseverance, its mechanical industry, and its financial resources. The plain statement of a few truths will also remove this conclusion. It will be seen, that the cost at which the victory over the Confederates was won is a financial burden, which effectually incapacitates the United States from again fighting with money; that the Northern people, in a moment of reckless phrensy, purchased their revenge by crippling themselves; and that the ruinous price paid for their triumph leaves their financial credit in as ugly a condition as their military. They, more than any other people, account money to be 'the sinews of war.' On that calculation, the ability of the people for future wars is to be measured by its ability to pay additional taxes, and to contract further loans in the money-markets of the world, for military enterprises. If the United States can get as much more money (and can find among Southern negroes and foreign emigrants another seven hundred thousand (700,000) of 'gudgeons,' to be befooled), then, perhaps, they are competent to the conquest of another spirited little nation of four or five million souls. Such seems to be the measure of their promise for military exploits in the future. There is something impressive to the bystander, in the exhibition of tremendous effort. If it be granted that the *athlete* can do again and again what we have just seen him do, he is invested in our eyes with a very portentous aspect; we feel that he would be a terrible fellow to have upon our hands. But when we discover that the present efforts (than which none less would have saved him from being beaten by his little adversary) are so far beyond nature, that they have ruptured a blood-vessel or an intestine, and crippled him for life, we degrade him from a formidable

antagonist to a broken down champion. Our panic is effectually cured.

To appreciate, then, the financial resources of the United States for further military enterprises, the experienced public man will examine the following points: the existing burdens of debt, which must still be provided for, whatever new one may be incurred; the cost of the existing administration, to the people; the ability and disposition of the people for tax-paying; the economy and efficiency of the present administration; the present state of the national credit, with the probable influence upon it of a great increase in the national indebtedness; the unity and patriotism of the popular feeling; and all these, compared with similar elements of strength in the nations which are to be the probable antagonists.

What then are the existing burdens of debt, which the United States must carry through any future wars? At the end of 1868, the recognized debt of the Federal Government was three thousand and eighty-six and a half millions of dollars (\$3,086,438,635). Nearly the whole of this accrued in the four years of the Confederate war. This total includes the current treasury notes, called greenbacks (which are the Government's promises to pay), and the certificated debt not yet bonded. The annual interest upon this debt, which must be raised by taxation, is one hundred and forty and a half millions (\$140,424,000); of which the larger part is paid in coin, although the loans were received by the Government in depreciated paper. To pay this debt, the United States have thirty-four and a third millions of souls (in 1866, 34,288,870). Let this debt be compared with that of the leading Powers of Christendom, especially those of Western Europe. England owes a national debt of three thousand six hundred and forty-two millions of dollars (\$3,642,000,000), and pays upon it an annual interest of one hundred and twenty-six millions of dollars (\$126,000,000). To bear these burdens, there are in the British Isles about twenty-nine millions (29,000,000) of souls; but they have, in the remainder of the British Empire, one hundred and fifty-four millions (154,000,000), who are commercially tributary to them, and thus supply the ability to pay taxes sixfold above their numbers. It must be remembered, also, that while the British debt is the gradual result of a

number of great wars and glorious enterprises, continued for generations, which have added vast territories and untold wealth to the Empire, the debt of the United States was nearly all incurred in four years, as the price of the desolation of the fairer half of their home domain.

The Empire of Austria has thirty-five and a half millions (35,500,000) of souls. Its national debt is about one thousand four hundred and nineteen millions of dollars (\$1,419,000,000). Austria is usually regarded as the most burdened and paralyzed of the great Powers of Europe. France, with its dependencies, has a population of forty-four and a half millions (44,500,000). Its national debt is two thousand two hundred and forty-seven millions of dollars (\$2,247,000,000). All these great Powers feel that, in the burdens of their debts for former wars, they have given caution to mankind for a pacific behavior in the future.

But the real burdens of the people of the United States have not yet been disclosed. The Governments of the several States acknowledge an aggregate of debt, amounting to about three hundred and fifty-seven millions (\$357,000,000). This should be added, because it is a part of the load the people have to carry; the payment of interest and principal must be provided from the taxes of the same tax-payers who pay the Federal debt. So, in comparing the burdens of the United States with those of its neighbors, fairness requires the same addition to be made; because here, this Federal, and these State Governments only perform, together, the same functions which in Europe are rendered to the people by the central governments. The State debts, then, must be added.

But this is not all. It is very well known that the Northern people were so averse to military service, that enlistments were, in most cases, procured only by high bounties. When the Central Government began to draw imperative requisitions for men on the States, the local authorities, instead of simply drafting the required numbers from among their own militia, almost universally made arrangements for purchasing mercenaries to supply their *quotas*; thus relieving their own citizens from the dreaded service. The price usually paid, towards the end, for the human cattle for Confederate shambles, was not less than fifteen hundred dollars each. A sorry commentary,

by the way, upon the courage and patriotism of that people, that so large a bribe was needed to persuade them to "save the life of the nation." But thus it came to pass, that not only the States, but cities, counties, country towns, and even the rural subdivisions called, among that people, townships, raised loans, and purchased substitutes. Laws were passed to authorize them to make such loans, and to levy the taxes necessary to provide for their interest. Money had indeed been raised, in many cases, for internal improvements, in the same mode; and similar loans for canals and railroads remain as a part of the popular burdens. The aggregate of these bounty-debts cannot be estimated by us, from any evidences in our reach; but some *data* will be given to enable the reader to approximate it. The city of Philadelphia alone, it is believed, owes a debt of forty-four millions (\$44,000,000), chiefly for bounties. It was a very "loyal" city. It claims about six hundred thousand (600,000) souls. The State of New York admits a bounty-debt of its own of twenty-six millions (\$26,000,000). But cities, counties and townships, within the State, have also their own little debts for this and similar objects, in addition. The Comptroller of the State Treasury received incomplete returns of these local debts, from which he made an aggregate, at the end of last year, of eighty-three and a half millions (\$83,500,000). The State of New York claims a population of three million eight hundred thousand (3,800,000). The two instances of this city and this State, may indicate how the local burdens have accrued.

A few other items may aid in our approximation. The Federal Secretary of War informs us that, in the latter part of the war, there were one hundred and thirty-six thousand (136,000) re-enlistments of the veterans honorably discharged. It is well known that these usually received the highest bounties. If we place them at fifteen hundred dollars each, these cost the Northern people two hundred and four millions (\$204,000,000). The system of bounties was general from May, 1863, until the end of the war. The Government itself fixed the *minimum* price of a man at three hundred dollars, by appointing that sum as the cost of an exemption from the draft. But it is well known that few substitutes were purchased at so cheap a rate. The Secretary of War informs us that after May 1, 1863, there were one million six hundred and

thirty-four thousand (1,634,000) enlistments. Placing the cost of each of these enlistments at three hundred dollars, which is far below the average bounty, somebody had to pay for them four hundred and ninety millions (\$490,000,000). The "bounty-jumpers," as is well known, perpetrated immense frauds; and the number of bounties paid them was far larger than that of the enlistments.

We are thus convinced that this huge "unknown quantity" in the problem, the local and State bounty-debt, cannot be less than many hundreds of millions of dollars. But in estimating the actual financial burden which the people of the United States must carry, through any future war, all this must be added. It was a part of the cost of the Confederate war. The interest and principal of it must be paid by the same people who have the Federal debt to pay. If the policy, pursued by the Government as to the local obligations incurred in the war of the Revolution, is again to prevail, all these bounty-debts should be assumed and funded by the United States. Already this claim is heard in many quarters. The recognized State and Federal debts, as we have seen, amount to three billion four hundred and forty-three million dollars (\$3,443,195,000). It is most manifest, that the total mass of public debt now resting on the American people (nearly the whole incurred in the late war), for the payment of which provision must be made by taxation, must be at least four billions of dollars (\$4,000,000,000). Mr. Andrew Johnson, late President of the United States, and an ardent advocate of the war, always affirmed constantly, that the total cost of the war, to the taxpayers, would prove to be five billions (\$5,000,000,000). He, of course, is good authority. And the interest on this debt is from *five to seven and one fifth per centum!*

Some may be so thoughtless as to suppose that *repudiation* would lift this vast *incubus* off the shoulders of the nation. The fatal objections to reaching that deliverance by that mode, are, first, that nobody would lend his money for the second war to a debtor who so treacherously rid himself of his obligations for the first; whence the national credit would at once succumb; and, secondly, that the annihilation of so many securities of public debt would immediately produce a financial convulsion, at which the private wealth of immense numbers at the North,

already to a very large extent speculative and factitious, would collapse, like a soap bubble pierced with a straw. The overburdened credit of the government cannot be lifted up by repudiation.

Another burden which the people of the United States must carry, through any future war, along with the interest of its existing debt, is the cost of its present administration upon the peace establishment. In the year 1868, the Federal income was about three hundred and seventy-six and a half millions (\$376,500,000), and the expenditures were about one million (1,000,000) more. We have seen that one item of this expenditure was the annual interest upon the debt, one hundred and forty millions and a half (140,500,000). This left something more than two hundred and thirty-six millions (236,000,000) as the cost of the military, naval and civil service. But the governments of the States, which are an unavoidable part of the public burdens, cost last year nearly seventy-six and a half millions (76,500,000). Adding this sum, we find that the American people actually paid to their governments, the last year, four hundred and fifty-three millions of dollars (\$453,000,000). And this was exclusive of the support of religion (with which the governments, State and Federal, profess to have nothing to do), and exclusive also of the costs of municipal administration, and of the larger part of the cost of the national education, which are paid for by the people separately. Nor is the interest on the vast bounty debts included.

Let this burden be compared with those borne by the leading nations of Europe, which are usually believed to tax the strength of their subjects as severely as nature can well endure. Austria, with a million (1,000,000) more of people than the United States, pays her government annually two hundred and thirty-eight and a half millions of dollars (\$238,500,000). The forty-four millions (44,000,000) of Frenchmen are taxed, in all, three hundred and eighty-five millions (385,000,000). The British Empire collects a national revenue of three hundred and thirty-seven millions (337,000,000). It appears, therefore, that the people of the United States now have the most costly and onerous system of government to sustain, and the heaviest taxation, in a season of profound peace, of any people in Christendom. But the most startling fact is, that their money goes



so very short a way towards defending the country. While Austria, out of the revenues above mentioned, pays the interest on her debt, and the whole cost of government, she sustains also two hundred and forty-four thousand (244,000) armed men, as her peace establishment; France, four hundred and fifty-eight thousand (458,000), and England, two hundred and six thousand (206,000). But the United States, with an income larger by one-fourth than the largest of them, and a home population whose government should cost little, seeing the people in theory govern themselves, sustains only fifty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty-one (56,881) soldiers, sailors, and marines, to defend the country! The comparison of this military establishment with that of Great Britain, is especially damaging, because that empire, like the United States, has no conscription, and raises its armies by enlistment and pay. How frightful must be that incompetency, disorder, and peculation, which, out of revenues so immense, effects so little for national defense!

In the United States a smaller population actually pays a larger sum than in any of the old despotisms of Europe. It is thus demonstrated that the taxation must be more onerous here than in any of them. Let this be illustrated in a few particulars. The municipal government of the city of New York, with about nine hundred thousand (900,000) people, costs twenty-two millions of dollars (\$22,000,000) annually, in addition to the State and Federal imposts. The taxes of the citizens of the State of New York exacted by State laws, amount to twelve dollars (\$12) annually for every soul. There are townships in that State where the Federal, State, and local taxes make six *per centum* upon the total values of all the property of every species, rated at a full valuation. The income tax of Great Britain is now (if we mistake not) two and a half pence on the pound sterling of clear income, which is but little over one *per centum*. The income tax of the United States is five *per centum*. This tax in Great Britain yielded, last year, not quite thirty millions of dollars (\$30,000,000); in the United States, thirty-three millions (\$33,000,000). But the former country, with its hundred and fifty-four millions (154,000,000) of commercial tributaries, is five times as able to pay an income tax as the United States.

It may be objected to this surprising picture, that it cannot be consistent with the elastic prosperity of this teeming, new country. The reply is, that the country is not now either elastic or prosperous. The burden of taxation is actually crushing it into a collapse. All industrious classes, who do not make their gains at the expense of others, are sensibly overburdened. The traffic of the country is unhealthy, and the circulation of commodities is extravagantly costly. Notwithstanding nominal high wages, the laborer is more and more depressed; and in our great metropolis every tenth human being is a pauper in midsummer!

Now if the people of the United States, with inferior numbers and ability for enduring taxation, are, in this time of peace, burdened with a larger debt, heavier taxes, and a more costly, prodigal, and inefficient government, than any of their great neighbors, it is plain they are financially helpless for great military enterprises against those neighbors.

But let this argument be enhanced by a view of the present state of the national credit. The only currency of the people is a depreciated paper, based, not on a capital stock of specie, but on the promises to pay of this overburdened debtor, the Government. And meantime the bonds of the United States, bearing six *per cent.* interest in specie, fluctuate in London from seventy-two to eighty-three in the hundred; while the scrip of the British national debt, paying an interest of only three and a half *per cent.*, sells almost at *par*! The present burdens of the people so obviously tax their utmost strength, that the credit of the Government staggers under those burdens in the hour of peace, and in the glow of recent victory. Let a grave danger arise, bringing the certainty of another great addition to this monstrous load, and the whole fabric of public credit would dissolve at once into ruin.

The Washington Government, if it is wise, will therefore cultivate a very pacific demeanor towards all its powerful neighbors. And it will be further inclined to this prudent policy, if it considers the tendency of its methods for conquering the South, and for treating it when conquered, to make the ex-Confederates trustworthy and staunch supporters of its flag under the burdens and trials of another war. The lesson to be drawn from this review of the "situation" is, therefore, obviously one of peace.

## STONEWALL JACKSON.<sup>1</sup>

A lecture delivered in Baltimore in November, 1872, by Rev. Dr.

R. L. Dabney.

---

(Anything from the able pen of Dr. Dabney concerning Stonewall Jackson would be read with interest. His position as Chief of Staff, his intimate personal relations with the great chieftain, and his study of his character and his campaigns when acting as his chosen biographer, peculiarly fit Dr. Dabney to tell the story of Jackson's life, or to delineate his character. We are confident, therefore, that our readers will thank us for giving them the following paper, even though there may be dissent from some of the views presented. We print it just as it was originally delivered, only regretting that we are compelled by the press upon our pages to divide it into two parts.)

I am expected to speak to-night of Stonewall Jackson. The subject sounds remote, antiquated, in these last days. How seldom does that name, once on every tongue, mix itself now-a-days, with the current speech of men? Is it not already a fossil name, almost? I must ask you, in order to inspect it again, to lift off sundry superincumbent *strata* of your recent living memories and interests, to dig down to it. Great is the contrast wrought by the nine calendar years which have intervened since the glory of conquering Jackson, and the sequel "Jackson is dead," were blown by fame's trumpet from Chancellorsville over all lands, and thrilled the *præcordia* in every Southern bosom. Then, the benumbing shock which the words struck into our hearts, taught us how great and heroic this man had made himself, how essential to our cause, how foremost in all our hopes. And when his great Superior said (with a magnanimity which matches Jackson's heroism), "Tell him he has lost his left arm; but I have lost my right arm"; all men felt, "Yea! Lee has lost his right arm; the cause has lost its right

---

1—From "Southern Historical Society Papers." April, May, 1883.

arm." And the thickening disasters which that loss soon entailed, taught them, educated them, for a time, to appreciate Jackson's as the transcendent fame of all our war. It sounded in every true heart; it echoed in us from the thunder of the final downfall. But now, who recalls it to his speech?

Why this? Was that fame an empty *simulacrum* worthy only to be a nine-days' wonder, or was his devotion a blunder? Or are our people changed, so as to be no longer able to appreciate that devotion? We hope not, for it were a sad thing for them, betokening moral death, decay and putrescence, that they should become incapable of a heart-homage to this name. We hope not.

But it is already antiquated; for the world moves fast in these times. Many things have happened in these times, to stir, to fatigue, to wring our hearts; great wrongs to be endured passively until endurance obtused the sensibility, multiplied tragical wails of friends sinking in the abyss of poverty and obscure despair; a social revolution; a veritable *cataclysmus*, which has swept away our old, fair, happy world, with its pleasant homes fragrant with ancestral virtues and graces, and has left us a new world, as yet chiefly a world of quicksand and slime; with no olive tree, alas, as yet growing. Yes; we have lived long in these nine evil years; to us they are a century of experiences. We are *odl*, very old, superannuated perhaps, those of us who remember Jackson, and the days when he fought for freedom. Will you not then bear with our garrulity a little, should we even babble of our hero? For it is a pleasant thing to recall those old days of wearing the grey, with a Jackson to lead us to assured victory, when we were *men* as yet; with rights and freedom of our own, slipping then indeed from our too inept hands, yet enough our own still to fight for; when we had hope, and endeavor and high emprise, inspired by our leader's example; and hardship and danger *for the cause*, endured cheerily, as a sport; when we had a country, loved all the more proudly that she was insulted and bleeding. The memory of those days is bright; but it is attended by a contrast most black and grim. Over against that splendid past, there glooms the shadow of the Mammon-Molock, named by mockery, "reconstruction," with its most noisome scalawag odor, reeking of the pit. The joy of this reminiscence must be

then a mixed joy, and the duty assigned me, while sacred and not unpleasing—never shall it be unpleasing to us to celebrate the fame of Jackson; for *him* the shadow touches not—yet a duty difficult and sad.

I remember well, that naught except a circumstance is deemed by you to have endowed this hand with any fitness to refresh the characters of that fame; the circumstance of a brief association with his person during the most glorious part of his career. You would fain hear from me what manner of man he appeared to one who was next to him, the ordinary mouth-piece of his will, the sharer of his bivouac and his morsel; who got the nearest glimpses through the portals of that reserve, which no man might enter, who watched closely, and he may even venture to affirm, intelligently, the outworkings of the secret power within. This so reasonable desire of yours I propose to satisfy, not by presuming to name and catalogue his attributes, analytically, by my judgment, or conceit, as may be—for this would be to regard you as pupils, rather than patrons—nor yet, by studying the cumulation of superlative, laudatory epithets,—for this would imply that I deemed you not only pupils, but gullible—but by painting before you some select, significant action of Jackson's own, wherein you may judge for yourselves as freely as other spectators, what manner of man this was. And I exhort you to expect in this description no grace, save the homely one of *clear truth*: homely it may be and most ungarnished, yet truly what my eyes saw and my ears heard. For is not this the quality most worthy of him who would portray *Jackson*? And should the narrative have, with its other unskillfulness, that of a certain *egotism*. I pray you bear in mind, that the necessity of this emerges in a manner from my task. For what is my qualification therefor? save that it was my *fortune*, along *with* many worthier men in the ranks *to behold* (not my *merit to do*) some of these wonders whereof you would fain hear; and when you ask for the testimony of the eye-witness, the humble Ego must needs speak in the egotistical first person.

And first, that I should ever have been invited to be next his person at all, was characteristic of Jackson. He, who was an *alumnus* of the military academy at West Point, and nothing but a professional military man all his life, was least bound

in professional trammels. This trait he signified, in part, by his selection of successive chiefs for his staff, none of whom had even snuffed the classical air of West Point or Lexington, my intended predecessor and actual successor (J. A. Armstrong and C. J. Faulkner), and the next successor (A. S. Pendleton), but chiefly by the selection of me, a man of peace, and soldier of the Prince of Peace, innocent, even in youth, of any tincture of military knowledge. Herein was indeed a strange thing; that I, the parson, tied to him by no blood tie, or interest, and by acquaintanceship only slightest and most transient; that I, at home nursing myself into partial convalescence from tedious fever, contracted in the performance of my spiritual functions among the soldiers of the previous campaign; that I, conscious only of unfitness, in body and mind, for any direct help to the cause, save a most sore apprehension of its need of all righteous help, and true love to it; that such an one as I should, in the spring of 1862, be invited by him to that post. Verily, had not all known "this is a man that doth not jest," it should have seemed to me a jest. But the wisest men, speaking most in God's fear, replied to me: "See that thou be not rash to shut this door, if it be that God hath opened unto thee." And *I feared to shut ti*, until he, by whom the call was uttered, should know how unfit I was to enter in. Further than this, in very truth, my mind went not.

But if you would hear on what wise Jackson was wont to speak, these are the *ipsissima verba*:

"Near Mt. Jackson, April 8th, 1862.

"*My Dear Doctor:*

"The extra session of our Legislature will prevent Mr. Jas. D. Armstrong, of the Virginia Senate, from joining me as my A. A. General. If the position would be acceptable to you, please take the accompanying recommendation to Richmond, get the appointment, and join me at once, provided you can make your arrangements to remain with me during the remainder of the war. Your rank will be that of Major. Your duties will require early rising and industry. Please let me hear from you at once.

"Very truly your friend,

"T. J. JACKSON."

Now, is not the fashion of these words a very revelation to him who will consider of the fashion of the man? He has time to tell that which is essential, but no word more. He makes it known, that his war *means work*, and is no diletantism, or amateur soldiering. Nor is it the warfare of gallant barbarians, wherein much castramental laziness or even license can redeem itself by some burst of daring and animal phrensy; but "early rising and industry." "Now, wilt thou, or wilt thou not?" And, if yes, then let thy act follow thy assent without dallying. But yet, only on one condition must the "yes" be said to such as him, to remain unchanged "during the remainder of the war." He who would aspire to work and fight as Jackson's next assistant, must be one who would not look back after he had put his hand to the plough; but one, who like his master, came to stay with his work until it was ended, except, perchance, God should first end him.

Thus then went I, to show Jackson why I might not enter into this door of service, and yet seem no recreant (in staying out) to my country's needs. I found him at a place, gateway of the mountains that befriended him, named of the vicinage Conrad's Store; the Shenandoah flood before him, and beyond, multitudinous enemies thronging—held at bay, checkmated, gnashing vainly upon him; while he, in the midst of din and marching battalions, going to the watch-post, and splashing squadrons, splashing through mire most villainous, and of snow-wracks and sleet of the ungenial spring,—of "winter lingering in the lap of spring,"—stood calm, patient, modest, yet serious, as though abashed at the meanest man's reverence for him; but at sternest peril unabashed. After most thoughtful, yea, feminine care of food and fire for me, he took me apart saying, "I am glad that you have come." But I told him that I was come, I feared, uselessly, only to reveal my unfitness, and retire; already half-broken by camp-disease, and enervated by student's toil. "But Providence," replied he, "will preserve your health, if he designs to use you." I was unused to arms, and ignorant of all military art. "You can learn," said he. "When would you have me assume my office?" "Rest to-day, and study the 'Articles of War,' and begin to-morrow." "But I have neither outfit, nor arms, nor horse, for immediate service." "My quartermaster shall lend them, until you procure your own." "But

I have a graver disqualification, which candor requires me to disclose to you, first of mortals; I am not sanguine of success; our leaders and legislators do not seem to me to comprehend the crisis, nor our people to respond to it; and, in truth, the impulse which I feel to fly out of my sacred calling, to my country's succor, is chiefly the conviction that her need is so desperate. The effect on me is the reverse of that which the old saw ascribes to the rats when they believe the ship is sinking." "But," saith he, laughing; "If the rats will only run this way, the ship will not sink." Thus was I overruled.

You will remember that theory of his character, which most men were pleased to adopt, when he was first entrusted with command: "This man," said they, "is true, and brave, and religious; but narrow and mechanical. He is the man to lead a fighting battalion, under the direction of a head that can think; but strategy, prudence, science, are not in him. His very reserve and reluctance to confer result from his own consciousness, that he has no faculty of speech nor power of thought, to debate with other men." Had I been capable of so misjudging his silence and modesty, as to adopt this theory, his career must ere this have blown it all into thin air; the first Manassas and Kernstown, and the retreat before Banks had already done *that*, for all save fools. All who served under him had already learned that there was in him abundant thought and counsel, deep and sagacious. He asked questions of all; sought counsel of none; "gave no account to any man of his matters." Once only, did council of war ever sit for him, to help him to "make up his mind." And it was then, by their inferior sagacity, made up so little to his liking, that he asked such aid no more. Power of speech there was in him also, as I witnessed; such truly eloquent speech, as uttered quickly the very heart of his thought, and could fire the heart of the listener. But he deemed that the controversy he waged was no longer parliamentary; that the only logic seemly for us at that stage, was the *ultima ratio Regum*. To such respondent as the times then appointed unto him, the cannon peal, and the charging yell of the "men in grey," were the reply, which to him seemed eloquent: all else was emptier than silence.

But instead of leading you to a brief review of his whole career, which would perforce be trite, because hurried, I would



describe to you some one of the exploits of his genius, which best illustrates it. One of these I suppose to be Port Republic. Let me, then, present it to you.

To comprehend the battles of Port Republic, you must recall the events which ushered them in; the defeat of Milroy at McDowell in the early May of 1862, that of Banks at Winchester; the concentration of Generals Fremont and Shields towards Strasbourg to entrap Jackson at that place; his narrow escape, and retreat up the great Valley to Harrisonburg. He brought with him, perhaps, a force of twelve thousand men, footsore from forced marches, and decimated by their own victories. No more succors could come to Jackson from the east; the coil of the snake around Lee and the Capital was becoming too close for him to assist others; and all that the government expected of Jackson was, to retreat indefinitely, fortunate if he could at once escape complete destruction, and detain the pursuers from a concentration against Richmond. Such was the outlook of affairs upon the 8th of June. On the 11th of June, both the pursuers were in full retreat, broken and shattered, fleeing to shelter themselves near the banks of the Potomac, while Jackson was standing intact, his hands full of trophies, and ready to turn to the help of Lee in his distant death-grapple with Mr. Clellan. Such was the achievement. Let us see how his genius wrought it out.

The skill of the strategist is in availing himself of the natural features of the country, which may be helpful to him. In this case these features were mainly the Blue Ridge mountains, dividing the great Valley from Piedmont, Virginia; the Shenandoah river, a noble stream at all times, and then everywhere unfordable because of its swollen state; and the Great Valley Turnpike, a paved road extending parallel to the mountain and river, from the Potomac to Staunton. From a point east of Strasburg to another point east of Harrisonburg extends the Masanuttin mountain, a ridge of fifty miles length, parallel to the Blue Ridge, and dividing the Great Valley into two valleys. Down the eastern of these, usually called the Page-county valley, the main river passes, down the other passes the great road. Up this road, west of the Masanuttin mountain was Jackson now retreating, in his deliberate, stubborn fashion, while Fremont's 18,000 pursued him. Up another road parallel, but

on the eastern side both of that mountain and of the main river, marched Shields, with his 8,000 picked troops. Neither had any pontoon train, for Banks had burned his in his impotent flight in May. Why did not Shields, upon coming over from the Piedmont to Front Royal, for the purpose of intercepting Jackson in the lower valley, at once cross the Shenandoah and place himself in effectual concert with his partner, Fremont? He had possession of a bridge at Front Royal. They were endeavoring to practice a little lesson in the art of war, which they fancied they had learned from the great teacher, Jackson, which they desired to improve, because it was learned, as they sorely felt, at the cost of grievous stripes, and indignities worse than those of the dunce-block. But their teacher would show them again, that they were not yet instructed enough to descend from that "bad eminence." Let me explain this first lesson.

The Blue-Ridge, parallel to the great Valley road, is penetrated only at certain "gaps," by roads practicable for armies. On the east of it lay the teeming Piedmont land, untouched by ravage as yet, and looking towards the capital and the main army of the Confederacy. This mountain, if Jackson chose to resort to it, was both his fastness and his "base of operations"; for the openings of its gaps offered him natural strongholds, unassailable by an enemy, with free communication at his rear for drawing supplies or for retreating. When Banks first pursued him up the Valley, he had turned aside at Harrisonburg to the eastward, and seated himself behind the river at Conrad's-Store in the mouth of Swift Run Gap. And then Banks began to get his first glimpse of his lesson in strategy. He found that his coveted way (up the great Valley road) *was now parallel to his enemy's base.* Even into his brain did the inconvenience of such line of advance now insinuate itself, and he paused at Harrisonburg. Paused awkwardly, with the road open to his coveted prize, Staunton, the strategical key of the commonwealth, with not a man in gray there to affright his doughty pickets: the quarry trembling for the expected swoop of the vulture. Forward, General Banks. *Carpe diem;* the road is open! But Banks would not forward—could not! There was a poised eagle upon the vulture's flank, with talons and beak ready to tear out the vitals beneath his left wing. Shall Banks face to the left and drag the eagle from his aerie,

and then advance? Let him try that. Then, there is the water-flood in front to be crossed, only by one long, narrow bridge, which would be manifestly a bridge of Lodi, but not with obtuse, kraut-consuming Austrians behind it. And there is the mountain, opening its dread jaws, right and left, to devour the assailant. No, Banks cannot even *try* that! What then shall he try? Alas, poor man, he knows not what; he must consider, sitting meanwhile upon that most pleasant village of Harrisonburg, amidst its green meadows. Is not the village now his veritable dunce-stool for the time, where he shall sit, reluctant, uneasy, "swelling and snubbing," until it appear whether he can learn his horn-book or not? And it was while he was there sitting, the horn-book not mastered, that Jackson like the tornado, made his first astounding gyration, his first thunder-clap at McDowell, away on the western mountain, his second echoing to it from Front Royal on the far east, his crowning, rending crash at Winchester. And Masters Banks and Shields find themselves with incomprehensible smoke and dust, clean outside the school-room, yea, the play-ground, they scarcely know how (they "stood not on the order of their going"), with eyes very widely glaring, yet with but little light of speculation in them.

This was lesson number first. And now say my masters to each other, "This lesson which cost us so dear, learned by buffetings so rude, yea, even kicks, with the bitter chorus of inextinguishable laughter of rivals, shall we not profit by it? Shall we not use it in our turn? Yea, we will not be always dunces: we will let people see that we can say, at least, that lesson again. The lion will retreat surlily, after he brake the toils at Strasburg, up the great Valley road, growling defiance, huge ribs of the prey between his jaws. Fremont shall closely pursue his rear with 18,000, and Shields shall advance abreast, between him and the mountain, with 8,000, to nead him off from his rock-fastness. We shall circumvent him in the open field; we shall confound him on the right hand and the left; the one shall amuse him in front, when he stands at bay, and the other shall smite him by guile under the ribs; and we shall take his spoils." And, therefore, it was that Shields crossed not the river below, at Strasburg, but remained apart from his mate.

They forgot that it is the prerogative of genius, to have no

need to repeat itself; its resources are ever new; it can invent, can *create* upon occasion. It is dull dunce-hood, which only knows how to repeat the lesson that has been well beaten into it. The Southern Lion, then, marches surlily up the great Valley, turning at bay here and there, when the whelps dog his heels too insolently, with a glare and a growl instructive to them to observe a wholesome interval; while Ashby, ubiquitous, peers everywhere over the Masanuttin, upon the advance of Shields—burns bridge after bridge, Mount Jackson bridge, White House bridge, Columbia bridge, entailing continued insolation upon him. The mighty hunt reaches Harrisonburg. Will it turn again eastward to the mountain? Shields shall see, he reaches Conrad's store. There is the old lair, the munition of rocks, but no Jackson seeking to crouch in it; only the bridge leading to it (and which alone could lead him out of it), just in flames. Evidently Jackson will teach some other lesson this time, and Shields and Fremont must learn it, at what cost they may. He will turn eastward again, and resort to the river and the mountains, whose floods and forests he will make fight for him, even as "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," but under conditions wholly novel.

Now that you may comprehend Jackson, I must endeavor to make you *see* this region of Port Republic, as nearly as may be. Behold then the side road from Harrisonburg to that village, passing over sundry miles of those high hills, common to calcareous regions, (lofty as the highest viewed from the northernmost end of your Druid Hill Park), mostly parallel to each other, and at right angles to the road, clad also frequently with woodlands upon their summits, the vales between filled with farms. Close at the foot of the last of these ridges flows the shining river, here running almost due east, as does the great mountain parallel to it, three miles away. Look thitherward, and between you and that green rampart you see, first the water, then smooth meadows far below you, spreading wider to the left, away to Lewiston, until their breadth expands almost to a mile; while underneath you stretches the long bridge, and nestles the white village amidst the level fields. Beyond, the forest begins, thick, tangled and bosky, pierced by more narrow, serpentine, but easy roadways, than your eye would suspect, and spreads away, rising into hills as it recedes towards the true

mountain foot. Just below the village comes a sparkling tributary, South river, deemed scarcely worthy of a bridge, and mingles its waters at the angle of the little green with its elder sister; while the one broad thoroughfare leads up the village and away to the southwest to Staunton; and the other, fording the lesser stream to the left, plunges into the forest to seek Brown's Gap. Look now, far away to the east, where river and mountain begin to lose themselves in the summer haze. You perceive that the tangled wilderness, after embaying one more modest farm below Lewiston, closes in upon the bank of the stream, ending for many miles, champaign and tillage, and allowing but one narrow highway to Conrad's Store, fifteen miles away. Such is your landscape from your elevated outlook northwest of the river; and this is the chess-board upon which the master hand is to move knights and castles, not his own merely, but also his adversary's.

Saturday, the 7th of June, Jackson led all his troops to those high hills northwest of the river, posting half of them three miles back, under Ewell, to confront Fremont, and the remainder upon the heights overlooking Port Republic, while he himself crossed the bridge and lodged in that village. That evening Fremont sat down before Ewell, and Shields, perceiving that he must seek Jackson still farther, pushed his army up the narrow forest road from Conrad's Store, and showed its head at Lewiston. Thus, Jackson's army and Fremont's were upon the one side of the river, Shield's and the village upon the other. To cross it there remained now but the one passage, which lay under the muzzles of Jackson's cannon, for all the bridges above and below had been burned.

Fremont and Shields would now, therefore, apply the old strategy, which red tape once deemed appropriate for the superior numbers. They would *surround* Jackson on sundry sides, with divided forces, from different directions, and thus crush him. The lessons of the old Napoleon had not been enough to teach them; this new Virginian Napoleon will, perhaps, illuminate their obtuseness, but with light too sulphurous for their delectation. This old plan, attempted against a wakeful and rapid adversary, capable of striking successive blows, only invites him "to divide and conquer." This Jackson will now teach them in his own time, and it shall be lesson number second.

They shall never strike together; nay, Shields shall never strike at all, but be stricken; thus hath the master of the game already decided.

Shall Jackson, then, hold Shields at arms' length, and strike the larger prey, Fremont, first? This the impassable river and the dominant position of his artillery overlooking the bridge, enabled him to do. He might have driven back Shields's co-operative advance in the meadows beneath, by a storm of shells, while he assailed his partner three miles away; and Shields might have beguiled the day, by looking helplessly over at the smoke surging up over the tree-tops, and listening to the thunder of the battle rolling back to Harrisonburg with Fremont's defeat; or, by reckoning when his own time would come, if that better pleased him. Shall Jackson, then, strike Fremont first? "Yes," said Ewell: "Strike the larger game first." But Jackson said, "No. The risk is less to deal first with the weaker. In a battle with Shields, should disaster perchance befall us, we shall be near our trains, and our way of retreat; and true courage, however much prudent audacity it may venture, never boasts itself invulnerable. But if an inauspicious attack were made on Fremont, the defeated Confederates would have behind them a deep river, to be crossed only by one narrow bridge, and a line of retreat threatened by Shields's unbroken force. Again, Shields defeated, had but one difficult and narrow line of retreat, between the flood and the mountain, and might be probably destroyed. Fremont, if defeated, had an open country and many roads by which to retire; and could not be far pursued, with Shields's force still unbroken threatening our rear." Thus argued Jackson, but only to himself, then; he was wont to give no account of his measures to others.

Shall Jackson, then, prepare to deal with his weaker adversary, by withdrawing all his arms to the Southern side, burning the bridge behind him, and thus leaving Fremont an idle spectator of Shields's overthrow? Again, No; and for two reasons: First, this would permit Fremont to crown all those dominating heights on the north side, with his artillery, so that Shields, though still separated from *his* friends by the water, might enjoy the effectual shelter of their guns. And second, supposing Shields dealt with satisfactorily, then it might be

desired to pay the same polite attentions to Fremont; and Jackson meant not to deprive himself too soon of the means of access to him. Shields, then, shall be first attended to, on the south side; but yet the bridge not destroyed, nor the heights beyond surrendered.

---

Paper No. 2.

---

(Conclusion.)

---

This plan, then, is clear even to the civic apprehension, as offering fewest risks and largest promise—in a word, the perfection of sagacity; and with so many men in gray as might match two-fold numbers of enemies (odds rather favorable, if not light and trivial, compared with the customary), it seems to promise safely. Perhaps some may even say that these reasonings *are* clear and just, even too much so to imply peculiar genius in Jackson. Remember, friend, Columbus and his egg. Jackson's *performance* hath illustrated this problem for you, made it all plain, which to him was all novel, urgent, and to have its right solution by him alone invented, then and there, under pressure of dire responsibility and penalty of portentous ruin and manifold destruction. These, friend, thou wouldst not have found propitious or helpful for clear meditation and judgment the night of that 7th of June. Believe me, the problem did not *then* seem easy, or even soluble to us, as men whispered by the watch-fires, with bated breath: "Jackson is surrounded." Our eyes, then beclouded with apprehension, confused, saw no light; but he, clear-eyed and serene, with genius braced by his steadfast heart and devout faith, saw all possibilities, and whence deliverance might dawn out of seeming darkness. And these two chiefest traits of greatness I recognized in Jackson through these transactions: First, that urgent and critical peril did not agitate nor confuse his reason, nor make him hang vacillating, uneasy and impotent to decide between the alternatives, but only nerved and steadied his faculties; that he ever thought best where other men could least think. Second, that he knew how to distinguish the decisive points from the unessential, and, grasping those with iron strength, to form from them an inflexible conclusion.

Events, then, had showed Jackson these things by the close of Saturday, June the 7th. Why did he delay to strike this time, so unlike his wont? The 8th was "the Sabbath of the Lord," which he would fain honor always, if the wicked would let him. *Not by him* should the sanctity and repose of that bright, calm Sabbath be broken. When I went to him early, saying, "I suppose, General, divine service is out of the question to-day?" his reply was, "Oh, by no means; I hope you will preach in the Stonewall Brigade, and I shall attend myself—that is, if we are not disturbed by the enemy." Thus I retired, to doff the gray for the time and don the parson's black. But those enemies cherished no such reverence. As at the first Manassas, and so many other pitched battles, they selected the holy day for an unholy deed. They supposed that the toils were closed again around the prey, and were eager to win the spoils before they escaped them. Shields, then, moves first to strike Jackson's rear, a detachment of cavalry, with two cannon in front, who sweep away the pickets with a sudden rush, dash pell-mell across the lesser river, into the street, almost as soon as the fugitives who would tell their coming. Then is there at headquarters mad haste, Jackson leaping into the saddle and galloping (the pass even now scarcely open) for the bridge and his army; Staff following as they may; one and another too late (as Colonel Crutchfield, our Chief of Artillery), and captured in mid street; a few yet, more too late, and wholly unable to follow; I, of course, again doffing the black to don the gray, among these last. Right briskly did those invaders (bold, quick men, for Yankees), occupy the village, plant cannon at each end of it, spy out Jackson's trains, and begin to reach forth the hand to grasp them, while we, cut off and almost powerless, make such resistance as we may. Haste thee, Master Shields. "What thou doest do quickly!" for NEMESIS is coming, and thy time is short—too short, alas! for Shields, for mortal man; for lo! yonder, *one* hath clattered through the bridge, and bounding up the heights where the forces lay, pressed his steed with burning spurs, his visage all aglow and blue eye blazing, and shouts: "Beat the Long Roll!" Drums roll with palpitating throb; men spring to the ranks, cannoneers harness; and ere Shields can brush away the flimsy obstacles between him and the trains, already Jackson comes streaming back with Poague's battery and



Fulkerson's tall riflemen—streaming down the hill, a flashing torrent. There is one crash of thunder, one ringing volley, one wild yell; the bayonets gleam through the shadowy cavern of the bridge, and the thing is done. Hostile cannon lie disabled, horses weltering around them in blood; intruders flee pell-mell, splashing through the stream, whither they came; while Jackson stands alone, over on the green hillside, still, calm, and reverent, his hand lifted in prayer and thanksgiving that the village is won again. But it is only for a moment, for he knows what more remains to be done. He remounts the heights, and there, sure enough, is Shields's army advancing up the meadows from Lewiston, ranks dressed, banners flying, in all the bravery of their pomp. Jackson utters a few quiet words, and Poague's guns, reinforced by others, remove to the next hill, depress their grim muzzles, and rain down an iron storm across the river, which lashes Shields back to his covert.

Jackson trusted Providence, and here Providence took care of him in a most timely way. Our Colonel Crutchfield, detained amidst his captors in the village street, shall tell how the intervention looked from his point of view. The cavalry Colonel commanding Shields's advance had only just disarmed him, when a Yankee vidette, who had ventured a little up the Staunton Road, came hurrying back, his eyes glaring with elation, and exclaimed: "Colonel Carrell! you have as good as got Jackson's trains; they are right above here, in sight; I have seen thousands of the white wagon-covers shining! You have nothing to do but ride forward and take them!" "Yes!" avouched Crutchfield's despairing thought, "he has them! There are no train-guards, and those white sheets, as I wofully know, are the covers of my ordnance-train, containing all the artillery ammunition and most of the other for the whole army. Colonel Carrell may not remain here permanently, but nothing can prevent his riding thither and doing irreparable mischief before Jackson's return."

Such was also the Yankee's thought, for he immediately ordered a strong squadron of his cavalry to go up and capture those trains. So the horsemen formed in column and advanced up the street, leaving Colonel Crutchfield in silent despair. But near the head of that street they were met by a discharge of canister at close quarters. The balls came ricocheting down the

road amidst the horses' legs, and back came the column in head long flight, with a tempest of dust. Said Crutchfield's thoughts to him: "Did those cannons drop from the skies? Did the angels fire them? I thought I was artillery-chief to that army, and had posted all the guns, and I thought I knew that there was no artillery there." But none the less did the mysterious guns hold their post, despite the cannonading of the Yankee battery accompanying their advance; and whenever the attacking column of cavalry was advanced, lash it back to the side-alleys with canister-shot until Jackson re-occupied the village.

The explanation was that there was a new battery, that of Captain Carrington, of Albemarle, just arrived, which Colonel Crutchfield had found so partially equipped and so absolutely unskilled, that he had relegated it with the baggage, and thus had actually discounted it in his mind as anything more than baggage. Two guns of this battery had been brought forward, with fragments of the fleeing Confederate pickets for supports, and with that audacity which, as Jackson taught, was on some occasions the most timely discretion, had made its little fight and saved the trains.

But now the cannonade answers back from Cross-Keys, where Fremont crowds upon Ewell, endeavoring to keep his part of the *rendezvous*. How the fight raged there through the day, while Jackson vibrated thither and back, watchful of all points, I need not detain you to relate; for your history-books may tell you all this, as also how Ewell hurled back his adversary, and held his own stoutly at all points. One little thing I may relate, not flattering to myself, which may be to you a revelation of Jackson's mind, (and may also be taken as an example of the scant encouragement which suggestions from subordinates usually met). As he sat upon his horse, scanning the region whither Shields had retired, I moved to his side and asked: "There is, then, a general action at Cross-Keys?" The answer was an affirmative nod. "Then General Shields will not be blind to the importance of his co-operating in it; he will surely attack you again to-day?" Hereupon he turned upon me, as though vexed with my obtuseness, with brows knit, and waving his clenched fist towards the commanding positions of the artillery near him, said: "No, sir; he *cannot* do it, sir. I should tear him to pieces!" And Shields did not do it, because he could not!

The two Yankee Generals have now had their forwardness a little rebuked; are taught to keep their places quietly until they are wanted. The Sabbath-eve has descended as calmly as though no blood or crime had polluted it, and Jackson has rested until the mid-night hour ushers in the working day with a waning moon. He then addresses himself to *his* work and takes the aggressive. The trains are sent over to Ewell to carry rations to his hungry men and to replenish the guns with their horrid food; a foot bridge is prepared for the infantry over South river, by which they may be passed towards Lewiston. Ewell is directed to creep away at daybreak, from Fremont's front, leaving only a skirmish line to amuse him, and to concentrate against Shields. Colonel Patton, one of the two commanders who are to lead this line, is sent for to receive his personal instructions from Jackson. "I found him," says Colonel Patton, "in the small hours of the night, erect, and elate with animation and pleasure. He began by saying: 'I am going to fight. Yes, we shall engage Shields this morning at sunrise. Now, I wish you to throw out all your men before Fremont as skirmishers, and to make a great show, so as to cause the enemy to think the whole army are behind you. Hold your position as well as you can; then fall back when obliged; take a new position; hold it in the same way, and I will be back to join you in the morning.'" Colonel Patton reminded him that his brigade was small, and that the country between Cross-Keys and the Shenandoah afforded few natural advantages for protecting such manoeuvres. He therefore desired to know for how long a time he would be expected to hold Fremont in check. He replied: "By the blessing of Providence, I hope to be *back by ten o'clock.*"

Here then we have the disclosure of his *real plan* to which he makes no reference in his own official report. He proposed to finish with Shields, peradventure to *finish Shields*, by ten o'clock. Five hours should be enough to settle *his* account, and he would then go straight back to see after Fremont. By ten o'clock of the same day he would meet his retreating skirmish line north of the river, arrest the retrograde movement and be ready, if Fremont had stomach for it, to fight a second pitched battle with his army, more than double the one vanquished in the morning. As to the measure of Shield's disaster, it was to

be complete; dispersion and capture of his whole force, with all his *material*. As Napoleon curtly said at the battle of *Rivoli*, concerning the Austrian division detached around the mountain to beset his rear: "*Ils sont a nous*;" so it seems had Jackson decreed of Shields's men: "They belong to us." This the whole disposition of his battle clearly discloses. I have described to you the position which Shields had assumed at Lewiston, with his line stretching from the forest to the river. Behind him were a few more smooth and open fields; and then the wilderness closed in to the river, tangled and trackless, overlooking the position of the Federal line in height, and allowing but one narrow track to the rear. It was a true funnel—almost a *cul de sac*. These then, were Jackson's dispositions. General Richard Taylor, with his Louisiana brigade, accompanied by a battery of artillery, was to plunge into the woods by those tortuous tracks which I have mentioned, to creep through the labyrinths, avoiding all disturbance of the enemy, until he had passed clear beyond his left, was to enfilade his short and crowded line, was to find position for his battery on some commanding hillock at the edge of the copsewood, and was to control the narrow road which offered the only line of retreat. The Stonewall brigade was to amuse the enemy meantime, in front, until these fatal adjustments were made, when the main weight of the army should crowd upon them, and they should be driven back upon the impassible river, hemmed in from their retreat, cannonaded from superior positions, ground, in short, between the upper and nether millstones, dissipated and captured. This was the morning's meal with which Jackson would break his fast. Then, for his afternoon work, he designed to re-occupy his formidable position in front of Fremont upon the north of the river, and either fight and win another battle the same day, or postpone the *coup de grace* to his second adversary until the next morning, as circumstances might dictate.

Such was the splendid audacity of Jackson's real design. Only a part of it was accomplished; you may infer that only a part of it was feasible, and that the design was too audacious to be all realized. I do not think so; only two trivial circumstances prevented the actual realization of the whole. When the main weight of the Confederate army was thrown against Shields he *was* crushed (though not captured) in the space of

two hours. Again, Fremont had been, on the previous day, so roughly handled by Ewell, with six thousand men, that he did not venture even to feel the Confederate position, guarded really only by a skirmish line, until ten o'clock the next day, and such was his own apprehension of his weakness, that as soon as he learned Shields's disaster definitely, he retreated with haste, even though there was now no bridge by which Jackson might reach him. Why then a performance so short of the magnificent conception? The answer was in two little circumstances. The guide who *thought* he knew the paths by which to lead General Taylor to the enemy's rear (a professional officer of the engineers) did not know; he became confused in the labyrinth; he led out the head of the column unexpectedly in front of instead of beyond their left, and General Taylor concluded he had no choice but to hold his ground and precipitate the attack. That was blunder first; a little one seemingly, but pregnant with disappointment. And here let me remark upon a mischievous specimen of red-tapeism, which I saw often practiced to our detriment, even sometimes by Jackson, who was least bound by professional trammels. It was the employing of engineer officers, with their pocket compasses and pretty, red and blue crayon, hypothetical maps, as country guides; instead of the men of the vicinage with local knowledge. Far better would it have been for Jackson had he now inquired among Ashby's troopers for the boy who had hunted foxes and rabbits through the coppices around Lewiston. Him should he have set to guide Taylor's brigade to the enemy's rear, with a Captain's commission before him if he guided it to victory, and a pistol's muzzle behind his left ear in case he played false.

The other blunder was, in appearance, even more trivial: The footbridge, constructed by moonlight, and designed to pass four men abreast, proved at one point so unsteady that only a single plank of it could be safely used. Thus, what was designed to be a massive column was reduced from that point onward to a straggling "Indian file." Instead of passing over the infantry in the early morning, we were still urging them forward when the appointed ten o'clock had come and gone, and the first attack on Shields, made with forces wholly inadequate, had met with a bloody repulse. Jackson, burning with eagerness, had flown to the front as soon as the Stone-

wall brigade was passed over, leaving to me a strict injunction to remain at the bridge and expedite the crossing of the other troops. First the returning trains, mingled in almost inextricable confusion with the marching column, was to be disentangled, amidst much wrong-headedness of little Q. M.'s swollen with a mite of brief authority. This effectually done; the defect of the bridge disclosed itself. Can it not be speedily remedied? No; not without a total arrest of the living stream, which none dared to order. Then began I to suggest, to advise, to urge, that the bridge be disused wholly and that the men take to the water *en masse* (kindly June water). For although it was Jackson's wont to enlighten *none* as to his plans; yet even my inexperienced ear was taught by the cannon thundering at Lewiston, that we should all have been, ere this, *there*; not pothering *here*, in straggling Indian file. Well did I know how Jackson's soul at that hour would avouch that word of Napoleon: "Ask me for *anything but time*." But no: "Generals had their orders: to march by the bridge." "They would usurp no discretion." Punctilious obedient men they! "keeping the word of promise to the ears, but breaking it to the sense." Well, in such fashion was the golden opportunity lost; and Jackson, at mid-day, instead of returning victorious to confront Fremont, must send word to his skirmish line, to come away and burn the bridge behind them, while he reinforces his battle against Shields and crushes down his stubborn (yea right gallant) resistance, with stern decision. Thus he must content himself with one victory instead of two, and in that one, chase his enemy away like a baffled wolf instead of ensnaring him wholly and drawing his fangs.

Who can hear this story of victory thus organized and almost within the grasp—victory which should have been more splendid than Marengo—so shorn of half its rays, without feeling a pungent, burning, sympathetic disappointment? Did not such a will as Jackson's then surge like a volcano at this default? No. There was no fury chafing against the miscarriage, no discontent, no rebuke. Calm and contented, Jackson rode back from the pursuit and devoted himself to the care of the wounded and to prudent precautions for protection. "*God did it.*" That was his philosophy. There is an omniscient Mind which purposes, an ever present Providence which superin-

tends; so that when the event has finally disclosed his will, the good man has found out what is best. He did not know it before, and therefore he followed, with all his might, the best lights of his own imperfect reason; but now that God has told him, by the issue, it is his part to study acquiescence—

Such was "Stonewall Jackson's way."

This, my friends, is a bright dream, but it is passed away. Jackson is gone, and the cause is gone. All the victories which he won are lost again. The penalty we pay for the pleasure of the dream is the pain of the awakening. I profess unto you that one of the most consoling thoughts which remain to me amidst the waking realities of the present, is this: that Jackson and other spirits like him are spared the defeat. I find that many minds sympathize with me in the species of awful curiosity to know what Jackson would have done at our final surrender. It is a strange, a startling conjunction of thoughts: Jackson, with his giant will, his unblenching faith, his heroic devotion, face to face, after all, with the lost cause! What would he have done? This question has been often asked me, and my answer has always been: In no event could Jackson have survived to see the cause lost. What, you say: would he have been guilty of suicide? Would he, in the last-lost battle, have sacrificed himself upon his country's funeral pyre? No. But I believe that as his clear eye saw the approaching catastrophe, his faithful zeal would have spurred him to strive so devotedly to avert it that he would either have overwrought his powers or met his death in generous forgetfulness (not in intentional desperation) on the foremost edge of the battle. For him there was destined to be no subjugation! The God whom he served so well was too gracious to his favorite son. Less faithful servants, like us, may need this bitter scourge. He was meeter for his reward.

Yes, there is solid consolation in the thought: Jackson is dead. Does it seem sometimes as we stand beside the little green mound at the Lexington graveyard, a right pitiful thing, that here, beneath these few feet of turf, garnished with no memorial but a faded wreath (faded like the cause he loved) and the modest little stone placed there by the trembling hand of a weeping woman (only hand generous and brave enough

even to rear a stone to Jackson in all the broad land baptized by his heart's blood), that *there* lies all this world contains of that great glory. That this pure devotion, this matchless courage, this towering genius are all clean gone forever out of this earth; gone amidst the utter wreck of the beloved cause which inspired them. Ah, but it was more pitiful to see a Lee bearing his proud, sad head above that sod, surrounded by the skeleton of that wreck, head stately as of old, yet bleached prematurely by irremediable sorrow, with that eye revealing its measureless depths of grief even beneath its patient smile. More pitiful to see the great heart break with an anguish which it would not stoop to utter, because it must behold its country's death, and was forbidden of God to die before it. But pitifulest of all is the sight of those former comrades of Jackson and Lee, who are willing to live and to be basely consoled with the lures of the oppressor, and who thus survive not only their country, but their own manhood. Yes, beside that sight the grave of Jackson is luminous with joy.

I well remember the only time when I saw him admit a prognostic of final defeat. It was a Sabbath day of May, 1862, as bright and calm as that which ushered in the battle of Port Republic. We were riding alone, slowly, to a religious service in a distant camp, and communing of our cause, not then as superior with inferior, but as friend with friend. I disclosed to Jackson the grounds of the apprehensions which I always harbored in secret, but which I made it my duty to conceal, after the strife was once unavoidable, from every mortal save him. He defended his more cheerful hopes. He urged the surprising success of the Confederate government in organizing armies and acquiring material of war in the face of an adversary who would have been deemed overwhelming, and especially the goodness of Divine Providence in giving us, so far, so many deliverances. I re-asserted my apprehensions with a pertinacity which was, perhaps, uncivil. I pointed out that the people were not rising as a whole to the height of the terrible crisis. That while the minority (all honor to them) were nobly sacrificing themselves in the breach, others were venal and selfish, eager to depute to hireling substitutes the glorious privilege of defending their own homes and rights, and to make a sordid traffic out of the necessities of the glorious



martyrs who were at the front dying for them. That it was at least questionable whether such men were not predestined slaves. That the government was manifestly unequal to the arduous enterprise and entangled in the plodding precedents of dull mediocrity, instead of rising to the exertion of lofty genius and heroism. Witness, for instance, the deplorable military policy which left our first critical victory without fruits; a blunder which no government would be allowed by a righteous Providence to repeat often, with impunity; because it is as truly a law of God's administration, as of his grace, which is expressed in the fearful question: "How can ye escape who neglect so great salvation?" That neither government nor people seemed awake to the absolute necessity of striking quickly in a revolutionary war like ours; but they were settling down to a regular, protracted contest, in which the machinery of professional warfare would gradually, but surely, abolish that superiority of the Southern citizen-soldier over the Yankee mercenary, which the honor and courage of the former gave him while both were undrilled; a routine-war in which we should measure our limited resources against their unlimited ones, instead of measuring patriotic gallantry against sluggishness. That the final issue of such a struggle must be the exhaustion of our means of resistance by gradual attrition, which would render all our victories unavailing. At length, as I enlarged upon the points, Jackson turned himself upon his saddle towards me and said, with a smile which yet had a serious meaning in it: "Stop, Major Dabney; you will make me low-spirited!" He then rode in silence for some moments, and said as though to himself: "I don't profess any romantic indifference to life; and certainly, in my own private relations, I have as much that is dear to wish to live for, as any man. But I do not desire to survive the independence of my country." These words were uttered with a profound, pensive earnestness, which effectually ended the debate.

Jackson prayed for the independence of his country; or, if that might not be, he desired not to survive its overthrow. God could not grant the former, for reasons to be seen anon, wherefore he granted the latter. The man died at the right time. He served the purpose of the Divine Wisdom in his generation. He went upward and onward upon the flood-tide

of his fame and greatness, until it reached its very *acme*; and thence he went up to his rest. After that came the ebb-tide, the stranding, and the wreck. This, surely, is a singular mark of Heaven's favor, lifting him almost to the rank of that antediluvian hero "who walked with God, and he was not; for God took him." When his fame and success were at their zenith, never yet blighted by disaster; when the cause he loved better than life was most hopeful; when he had just performed his most brilliant exploit, and could leave his country all jubilant with his praise, and glowing with gratitude for his deliverance; before the coming woe had projected upon his spirit even the fringe of that shadow which would have been to him colder than death—that was the time for Jackson to be translated.

The other thing, which alone would have been better—to lead his country on from triumph to triumph to final deliverance—to hang up his sword in the sanctuary, and to sit down a freeman amidst the people he had saved—that we would not permit God to effect; and that we were not fit to have such deliverance wrought for us, even by a Jackson, this God would demonstrate before he took him away; for the true great man is a gift from heaven, informed with a portion of its own life and fire. Some small critics have argued that great men are born in their times; that they are mere impersonations of the moral forces common to their contemporaries. This, be assured, may be true of that species of little great men, of whom Shakespeare writes, that "they have greatness thrust on them." The true hero is not made by his times, but makes *them*, if indeed material of greatness be in them. They wait for him, in sore need, perhaps, of his kindling touch, groping in perilous darkness towards destruction, for want of his true light: they produce him not. God sends him. There be three missions for such a true great man among men. If "the iniquity of the Amorites is already full," the Great Power, the wicked great man, Caesar or Napoleon, is sent among them to seduce them to their ruin. If they be worthy of greatness, and have in them any true substance to be kindled by the heroic fire, the good hero, your Moses or Washington, shall be sent unto them for deliverance. If it be not yet manifest to men whether the times be the one or the other, Amoritish, utterly reprobate, and fit only for anarchy or slavery, or else with

seed of nobleness in them, and capable of true glory (though to Him who commissions the hero there be no mystery nor contingency which is not manifest), then will he send one, or peradventure several, who shall be *touchstones* to that people, to "try them so as by fire," whether there be worth in them or no. And then shall this God-sent man show forth an exemplar to his people, which shall be unto them a test, whether they, having eyes, see, or see not the true glory and right, and whether they have hearts to understand and love it. And then shall he bring nigh deliverances unto them, full of promise and hope, yet mutable, which are God's *overtures* saying unto them: "Come now and let us reason together. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Will ye, or will ye not? Thus was Jackson God's interrogatory to this people, saying to them: "Will ye be like him, and be saved? Lo, there! What would a *nation* of Jacksons be? That may ye be! How righteousness exalteth a people! Shall this judgment and righteousness 'be the stability of thy times, O Confederate, and strength of thy salvation?'" And these mighty deliverances at Manassas, Winchester, Port Republic, Chickahominy, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, were they not manifest *overtures* to us to have the God of Jackson and Lee for our God, and be saved? "Here is the path; walk ye in it."

And what said our people? Many honestly answered, "Yea, Lord, we will"; of whom the larger part walked whither Jackson did, and now lie with him in glory. But another part answered, "Nay," and they live, on such terms as we see, even such as they elected. To them, also, it was plain that Jackson's truth and justice and devotion to duty were the things that made him great and unconquerable. Even the wicked avouched this. Therefore a nation of such like men must needs be unconquerable and free. But they would not be free on such terms. Nay; they preferred rather to walk after their own vanities. Verily they have their reward! Let the contrast appear in two points. Jackson writes thus to his wife:

"You had better not sell your coupons from the" (Confederate) "bonds, as I understand they are paid in gold; but let the Confederacy keep the gold. Citizens should not receive a cent of gold from the government when it is so scarce."

Set over against this the spectacle of almost the many, except the soldiers, gone mad at the enhancement of prices with speculation and extortion, greedy to rake together paper money, mere rags and trash, while such as Jackson were pouring out money and blood in the death grapple for them. Take another: He writes to his wife, Christmas, 1862, in answer to the inquiry whether he could not visit her, and see the child upon which he had never looked, while the army was in winter-quarters:

"It appears to me that it is better for me to remain with my command so long as the war continues, if our ever-gracious Heavenly Father permits. The army suffers immensely by absentees. If all our troops, officers and men, were at their posts, we might, through God's blessing, expect a more speedy termination of the war. The temporal affairs of some are so deranged as to make a strong plea for their returning home for a short time; but our God has greatly blessed me and mine during my absence; and whilst it would be a great comfort to see you, and my darling little daughter, and others in whom I take special interest, yet duty appears to require me to remain with my command. It is most important that those at headquarters set an example by remaining at the post of duty."

Look now from this picture of steadfastness in duty to the multitudes of absentees and of stalwart young men shirking the army by every slippery expedient. So these answered back to God's overture: "Mammon is dearer than manhood, and inglorious ease than liberty." The disclosure was now made that this people could not righteously be free, was not fit for it, and that God was just. Jackson could now go home to his rest. He in the haven, the ebb-tide might begin; he safely housed, the storm of adversity might burst.

The thing to be most painfully pondered then, by this people, is: Whether the fate of Jackson, and such like, is not proof that we have been weighed in the balances and found wanting? How readeth the handwriting on the wall? Not hopefully, in verity of truth, if Truth, which heroes worship, be indeed eternal, and be destined to assert herself ever. Jackson, alas, lies low, under the little hillock in Lexington graveyard, and Lee frets out his great heart-strings at this world-wide vision of falsehood and vile lucre, cruel as sordid, trium-

phant, unwhipped of justice; while the men who ride prosperously are they who sell themselves to work iniquity, and who say "Evil, be thou my good." Yea, these are the men whom the people delighteth to honor; to whom the churches and ministers of God in this land bow down, proclaiming: "Verily success is divine; and Might it maketh right; and the Power of this world, *it* shall be God unto us." And while the grave of heroic Truth and virtue has no other memento than the humble stone placed there by a feeble woman's hand, pompous monuments of successful wrong affront the skies with their altitude, "calling evil good and good evil, and putting darkness for light and light for darkness." We fear that when Truth shall reassert herself it will go ill with this generation.

## THE NEGRO AND THE COMMON SCHOOL.

*Dr. L. R. Dickinson, Editor Planter and Farmer.*—*Dear Sir:* I have read the essays of "Civis" in your December, January and February numbers with profound interest, and with general approbation. Concurring fully with him in the opposition to the whole theory of primary education by the State, I also feel the force of his views concerning the negro and the common school. For some years I have had strong convictions of the falsehood and deadly tendencies of the the Yankee theory of popular State education; and I confess that the influence which prevented my lifting up my voice against it was, simply, the belief that so puny a voice could effect nothing against the prevalent "craze" which has infected the country on this subject. You may conceive, therefore, the satisfaction with which I saw "Civis" take up the cause of truth in the columns of the *Religious Herald*, and subsequently in the *Planter and Farmer*, and my admiration for his moral courage, eloquence and invincible logic. With such champions, the cause of truth is not so hopeless as I feared. With equal satisfaction I have seen the Rev. Dr. John Miller, long an honored citizen of Virginia, and a gallant soldier in her army, arguing the same truth in the *Tribune*, with even more than his wonted terseness, boldness and condensed logic. There is another sign that the cause of truth is not wholly lost: this is the new zeal of the self-constituted protectors of this Yankee heresy in Virginia, in circulating arguments and pleas for their error. These documents have had no other effect on my mind than to awaken the wish that, if we must, perforce, have this false system imposed on us by our conquerors, any executive agency, created to administer the ill-starred plan, might at least have the modesty to stick to its appointed business, and not waste the money of the people in the attempt to manufacture among the people an erroneous public opinion. It is enough to be taxed heavily, against my judgment, for a quixotic project, which can never

do me or any one else any good. I am unjustly forced to surrender my money; but I beg leave to preserve the privilege of doing my own thinking. At least, I do not propose docilely to receive my opinions out of it from those, who, in advocating the system, are also advocating their own official emoluments.

While speaking of the general subject, I am tempted to notice a recent argument which is flaunted before us: this is, the rapidly increasing popularity, which, it is claimed, the plan is winning at the South. The reply is, that if this popularity is growing, it exactly confirms the argument of "*Civis*," that the system is agrarian, corrupting, subsidizing the people and debauching their independence. Imperial donatives to the Roman populace became very popular; true, but they poisoned the last good element of Roman character, and helped to complete the putrescence of the empire. I fear it is only too true, that this cunning cheat of Yankee state-craft is *alluring* the poor, harassed Southern parent; and that he is yielding to the bait, which promises deceitfully to relieve him of his parental responsibility. A bribe, alas, may become easily popular in decadent times.

But, you asked for my opinion of this fearful question of the negro in our common schools. It is not necessary for me to repeat the points so strongly put by "*Civis*." To one of them only, I would add my voice: the *unrighteousness* of expending vast sums, wrung by a grinding taxation from our oppressed people, upon a pretended education of freed slaves; when the State can neither pay its debts, nor attend to its own legitimate interests. Law and common honesty both endorse the maxim: "A man must be just before he is generous." The action of the State, in wasting this money thus, which is due to her creditors, is as inexcusable as it is fantastical. I do know that not a few of our white brethren, before the war, independent and intelligent, are now prevented from educating their own children, because they are compelled to keep them in the corn-field, laboring from year's end to year's end, to raise these taxes to give a pretended education to the brats of the black paupers, who are loafing around their plantations; stealing a part of the scanty crops and stock their poor, struggling boys are able to raise. Not seldom has this pitiful sight made my blood boil with indignation, and then made my heart bleed with the thought:

"How mournfully complete is that subjugation, which has made men, who were once Virginians, submit tamely to this burning wrong?" "The offense is rank, and smells to Heaven." Thank God, that I have only to pay, and have nothing to do with the imposition, collection and disbursement of this shameful exaction.

The argument by which they endeavor to reconcile us to it is always this: "Negro suffrage is a fixed fact; Virginians cannot help it; and if the negro is to share in governing the State, our interest is to qualify him for doing so, by educating him." To this argument many well-meaning men reluctantly yield. My first remark upon it is: That I am not at all clear, that candor, or truth, or self-respect will allow any Virginian thus to accept the impossible *onus*, which conquest seeks to impose on us. Radicalism thrusts upon us this fatal innovation of negro suffrage; and then requires of us a promise that *we will undertake to make it work safely and beneficently*. I beg leave to demur from making any such promise. I do not mean to divide with the conqueror the *onus* of his ruthless and murderous crime against liberty and civilization. He has committed it; let him bear its responsibility. If it is not undone, it will destroy both American liberty and civilization. If I could prevent that result, I would; and if I believed that I could, I would promise to try. But, knowing that I cannot prevent that result, and *that no human power can*, unless the crime be retracted, I do not mean to make a deceitful promise, or to divide the damning responsibility of the crime with its perpetrators. If I saw a ruthless quack proposing to divide a man's carotid artery, in a mad surgical experiment, and he should ask me to promise to tie it up, so as to remedy the murder he was committing, I should tell him that, however anxious to save the life of his victim, *I was not able* to do it by tying up a carotid artery, and could not promise. If he persevered in murdering the man, he must bear the guilt alone.

For, second: the pretended education which Virginia is now giving, at so heavy a cost, to the negroes, is, as a remedy for negro suffrage, utterly deceptive, farcical and dishonest. The tenor of the argument concedes, what every man, not a fool, knows to be true: that the negroes, as a body, are now glaringly unfit for the privilege of voting. What makes them



unfit? Such things as these: The inexorable barrier of alien race, color, and natural character, between them and that other race which constitutes the bulk of Americans: a dense ignorance of the rights and duties of citizenship: an almost universal lack of that share in the *property* of the country, which alone can give responsibility, patriotic interest and independence to the voter: a general moral grade so deplorably low as to permit their being driven or bought like a herd of sheep by the demagogue: a parasitical servility and dependency of nature, which characterizes the race everywhere, and in all ages: an almost total lack of real persevering aspirations: and last, an obstinate set of false traditions, which bind him as a mere serf to a party, which is the born enemy of every righteous interest of our State. Let the reader look at that list of ailments. Not an item can be disputed. Now, our political quacks propose to cure them, and that in such time as will save the Commonwealth before the infection becomes mortal. And how? By such an infusion of (not education, but) a *modicum* of the arts of reading, writing, and cyphering; which are at best uncertain means, only, for educating; and that, such a *modicum* as the kind of teachers and schools Virginia can now get, will infuse through the wool of such heads. Does any sane man really believe this remedy will do that vast work? Nay, verily, "Leviathan is not so tamed." Or, to return to the former trope, we may use the exclamation of John Randolph against a weak book, which was proposed to him, as an antidote for the malignant ability of Bolingbroke's infidelity. "Venice treacle, and syrup, against *Arsenic!*" Whether this remedy will save us, may be settled by an argument of fact, unanswerable to every patriotic Virginian. The Yankees have had this "nostrum" of free school education, in full force, for two generations. Has it reared up among them, out of white people, a popular mass fit to enjoy universal suffrage? Did not this very system rear us that very generation, which, in its blind ignorance and brutal passion, has recently wrecked the institutions of America; has filled our country with destitution, woe and murder; and, with a stupid blindness, only equalled by its wickedness, has stripped its own Commonwealths, in order to wreak its mad spite on ours, of the whole safeguards for their own freedom and peace? *These are the fruits of this Yankee system of State primary educa-*

tion, as working on a white race. Will it work better on a black race? I have not yet learned enough of that type of "intelligence" which this system seems to foster, to repudiate my Saviour's infallible maxim, "the tree is known by its fruits." The Yankee has bragged so much of his "intelligence," of his floods of books and oceans of newspapers, that some Southern people seem "dazed" by the clamor. Well; there may be "fussiness," there may be plenty of self-conceit, and flippancy; but I stand simply and firmly by this impregnable fact: This system has not given the Yankee true wisdom enough to prevent his destroying the country and himself. What mere self-delusion is it, to dream that it will give this quality to the negro?

But, third: There are causes peculiar to the negro and the South, which leave us no hope that this so-called system of free schools will produce even as much fruit as in New England or New York. One is the fact which "Civis" has so boldly stated: The black race is an alien one on our soil; and nothing except his amalgamation with ours, or his subordination to ours, can prevent the rise of that instinctive antipathy of race, which, history shows, always arises between opposite races in proximity. Another cause is the natural indolence of the negro character, which finds precisely its desired pretext, in this pretended work of going to school. Still another is the universal disposition of the young negro to construe his "liberty" as meaning precisely, privilege of idleness. It was easy to see that the free school must needs produce the very result which it is usually producing, under such exceptional circumstances; not education, but discontent with, and unfitness for, the free negro's inevitable sphere and destiny—if he is to have any good destiny—manual labor. With such teachers, such parents as the negro parents, and such material, it was hopeless to expect any really beneficial knowledge of the literary arts to be diffused among this great mass of black children. The only thing the most of them really learn is a fatal confirmation in the notion that "freedom" means living without work, and a great enhancement of the determination to grasp that privilege. The one commanding and imperative necessity of the young negro at the end of the war, in the eyes of any sober philanthropist, was this: that he should be promptly made to learn some way to earn an honest living. The interest which the Common-

wealth had in his quickly learning this vital lesson, was perilously urgent, as I shall show. Instead, then, of giving any negro over five years old a pretext of any sort for evading his righteous and beneficent lot of manual labor, we should have bent every energy of statesmanship and government to the task of somehow keeping the grown negroes at their work, and making sure that the young ones were taught to work. To this end nearly all the practical talent and energy should have been bent. The police administration should have been so omnipotent and energetic as absolutely to cut off the possibility of a negro family's subsisting by plunder—vagrancy should have been rendered impossible by stringent laws, apprenticing the loafer to an industrious citizen. The tolerance of idleness in children approaching adult age, by their parents, should have been made a misdemeanor, justifying the intervention of the magistrate. Such a system of *stimuli*, if made effective, must have been harsher than domestic slavery. I reply, yes: but in imposing it, we should be but imitating our conquerors, who ordained that the wise, kindly, benevolent, yet efficient system of the South should give place to their more pretentious but oppressive system. We are fully justified by the rights of self-preservation, to imitate their severity. Here is a parable which expresses accurately the folly Virginia has committed. She saw a neighbor of her's, named, we will say, Smith, who was very rich, and who also had a large family of healthy children. Smith is using a part of his abundance, in sending all of his children to school. Now Virginia is not rich, but desperately poor; and it will be "touch and go" if some of her children do not actually starve before the year is out. Moreover, Virginia's children are in so feverish, unhealthy a state, that confinement with books is likely to have no effect, except brain-fever. But the old lady sees Smith's gang passing her door to school every day, with envious eyes. She feels that somehow "book-larnin" is a social distinction. She hears Smith's children "chaffing" hers about their inferiority of privilege, and she can stand it no longer. So she completes her own bankruptcy to buy an outfit of "store clothes," and school-books, and sends all her children. Luckless urchins! what they needed was wholesome food and medicine, not books and confinement. The result of this blind disregard of times and differences, and abilities, is, that about

the time famine and the sheriff are both knocking at the old lady's door, her children are sent back to her, in raging delirium from brain fever, either helpless, or rending each other in their phrensy.

question fairly in the face? It makes me shudder—and the

Does any one demur, that this picture is extravagant? Then, he has not begun to see the fearful peril of our situation. Indeed, I feel sure that bad as is the present state of Virginia (in consequence of the abolition measure forced upon us) far the worst is yet to come. What are we to do with this young generation of negroes now growing up? Have men looked that free school is one of the most tragical features in the coming drama. Let these facts be considered. *This coming generation will be a numerous one.* Men, like "Civis," are evidently nursing the secret hope that it will not; and to my mind it is one of the most painful evidences of the atrocity of the wrong perpetrated on Virginia by her conquerors, that good, patriotic, philanthropic, Christian men here see the evil fruits of that crime looming up so fearfully, as actually to find a grain of private consolation in the *hope!* that a race of human beings among us are advancing to the miseries of extermination. I do not find fault with the hope; it is natural—I shall naturally and justifiably hope that my wilful destroyer may perish before he murders me—I condemn the oppression which has left good and wise men no solace except in that hope. They scan the bills of mortality in Southern cities with a sigh of relief. Doubtless city-life is a devouring gulf for the poor freedman, but Virginia is a rural State; and in the country, the lazy freedman multiplies, unstinted by his poverty. The climate is genial, the winter is short, the persimmons and blackberries span the larger part of the year; the "old hares" are prolific; the old freedmen, once slaves, still do about half work, and produce some provisions; and above all, the process of eating up the white people by petty pilferings is still far from completed. So, between these various resources, country negroes manage to sustain these low conditions of existence, which enable so low a race to multiply; and they multiply on, as yet, very much as in old times. This perilous incoming generation will be a numerous one.

The next fact is, that *the negro is a creature of habit.* Those

whose characters were formed in slavery still carry with them two habits gained there; one, that of work (though gradually relaxing); the other, that of loyalty and affectionate respect for "their white folks." The new generation cherishes neither. I know of only one or two, of either sex, who are engaged in any self-supporting labor—they live on their parents, or on pilfering. Does one see any of them apprenticed to any useful trade, or in the regular employment of any business man? I have with me the testimony of the planters; they tell me that, in hiring hands, they always seek middle-aged ones, who were trained in slavery; the younger are not worth hiring, if they ever offer. I have with me the testimony of the middle-aged freedmen, the fathers and mothers themselves. Their complaint is, that the "young ones have no idea of work—they do not know what real work is—what is to become of them, the Lord only knows." All who know the negro character are aware also of that infirmity of purpose which, almost universally renders them inefficient parents. They are either too weak or indulgent, or they are brutally and capriciously severe. Hence, the usual law of negro families is, a low state of parental and filial qualities, dissatisfied parents, and insubordinate children—it was always so upon the plantations, except as the master or overseer guided and reinforced the father's rule; it is flagrantly so now. The ugliest feature of this coming day is, that the young negroes are evidently growing up with a restive, surly, insolent spirit towards the whites, in place of that close family affection, feudal loyalty, and humble pride in their superiors, which once united masters and servants. How can it be otherwise? The family tie is gone forever—the "carpet bagger" has played his accursed game upon the negro's passions. Suffrage and the free school awaken in the young negro foolish and impossible aspirations, which are fated to disappointment, and whose disappointment he will assuredly lay to the door of his white rivals, lately his kindly protectors. One needs only to walk by the way, to see this change of temper. The ex-slave greets his former "white folks" with a smile of genuine pleasure, and with all the deference of old times. But his son and daughter pass without speech, or with a surly nod, and assert their independence by shouldering white children from the sidewalk. What, meantime, is the temper to which these white

young people are growing up? They also are strangers to the family feeling; they know nothing of the kindly responsibility and patronage begotten by the former dependence of the servants; to them these insolent young blacks are simply strangers and aliens, repulsive and abhorred. The sons of the heroes who fell at Manassas and Gettysburg are not likely to imbibe from widowed mothers traditions which will make them very tolerant of "negro impudence."

The State of New Jersey has emancipated her slaves recently enough, for men now living to testify to the effects of the measure. The account that I have uniformly heard from her citizens is this: That the negroes reared in slavery continued to be useful, but that when this generation had passed away, business men ceased, as a general rule, to employ negroes in any permanent contract of labor. They were found too fickle, uncertain and indolent. Ask a New Jersey farmer to employ a negro for his permanent farm help, and he would answer with a smile at your absurdity. After a time negroes almost ceased to be seen in rural districts; they drifted into taverns, barbers' shops and other places where "jobs" could be picked up. What right have we to flatter ourselves with a different result in Virginia.

Now an industrious community can endure a certain percentage of idlers, but if it be increased too much, they poison the community. The body politic is, in this, like the natural body, a certain amount of poison in its circulation can be endured, and eliminated by the emunctory organs, but if the poison is in larger quantity, the man dies. When the generation of freed-negroes, which works feebly, has passed away, can the white people of Southside Virginia endure the pilfering of a body of negroes more numerous than themselves, who will work not at all? And when the white people are at last driven to the end of all patience by intolerable annoyances, and the blacks are determined to live and not to work, collision cannot but ensue. What shall we do with that generation of negroes "educated" to be above work? I see no other prospect, humanly speaking, except the beginning of a war of races, which will bring back the provost marshal, and the government of the bayonet, and will, indeed, make us eager to welcome them.

But even if this danger is evaded, I object to this whole

scheme of State education for negroes, because, if successful, it can only result in wrong. In every civilized country, there must be a laboring class. The idea that this universal "education," so-called, is to elevate that laboring class into a reading body, and still leave them laborers, is a vain vision. The people who are addicted to manual labor are never going to be students, as a body. It is not so in boasted Prussia, nor in boasting New England. Laborers, if taught the arts of letters in their youth, disuse them in their toiling manhood. The brain which is taxed to supply the nervous energy for a day of manual labor, will have none left for literary pursuits. If our civilization is to continue, there must be, at the bottom of the social fabric, a class who must work and not read. Now, grant that that the free school does all that its wildest boasts can claim; that it elevates the negroes out of this grade. Then the only result will be, that white people must descend into it, and occupy it. Where then is the gain? I, for one, say plainly, that I belong to the white race, and that if I must choose between the two results, my philanthropy leads me to desire the prosperity of my own people, in preference to that of an alien race. I do not see any humanity in taking the negro out of the place for which nature has fitted him, at the cost of thrusting my own kindred down into it. No amelioration whatever is effected in the country taken as a whole; but an unnatural crime is committed to gratify a quixotic and unthinking crotchet.

Again: Let us grant that free schools effect all that is claimed for the elevation of the negro; that he is actually fitted for all the dignities of the commonwealth, and for social equality. Then, will he not demand it? Of course. Here then, is my concluding *dilemma*. If these negro schools are to fail, they should be abolished without further waste. If they are to succeed, they only prepare the way for that abhorred fate, *amalgamation*. If the State School Board are working for anything, they are working for this; here is the goal of their plans. The most solemn and urgent duty now incumbent on the rulers of Virginia, is to devise measures to prevent the gradual but sure approach of this final disaster. The satanic artificers of our subjugation well knew the work which they designed to perpetrate: it is so to mingle that blood which flowed in the

veins of our Washingtons, Lees, and Jacksons, and which consecrated the battle fields of the Confederacy, with this sordid, alien taint, that the bastard stream shall never again throb with independence enough to make a tyrant tremble. These men were taught by the instincts of their envy and malignity, but too infallibly, how the accursed work was to be done. They knew that political equality would prepare they way for social equality, and that, again for amalgamation. It is only our pride which hides the danger from our eyes. A friend from Virginia was conversing, in London, with an old English navy surgeon, who was intimately acquainted with the British West-India Islands. He assured the Virginian that the "reconstruction acts" tended directly to amalgamation, and would surely result in it if persevered in. "Never," exclaimed my Virginia friend, "In our case, our people's pride of race will effectually protect them from that last infamy." "Had ever any people," replied the ex-surgeon, "more pride of race than the English? Yet they are amalgamating in Jamaica. We have the teachings of forty years' experience in this matter; when your emancipation has become, like ours, forty years old, you will see." The Virginian was silenced. Even now, after ten years of the misery and shame of subjugation, one has only to open his eyes to see the crumbling away of the social barriers between the two races. The nearest and heaviest share of this curse of mixed blood will, of course, fall upon the conquered States themselves; but the revengeful mind will have the grim satisfaction of seeing the conquering States reap their sure and fearful retribution from the same cause. Eleven populous States, tainted with this poison of hybrid and corrupted blood, will be enough to complete the destruction of the white States to which they will be chained. The Yankee empire will then find itself, like a strong man with a cankerous limb, perishing by inches, in chronic and hideous agonies. The member which spreads its poison through the whole body can neither be healed nor amputated, all will putrify together.

Is there any *remedy*? This is the question which will be urged, and those who think with me are listened to with disfavor, chiefly because people do not like to be reminded of a shameful and miserable future, which they suppose to be unavoidable; they prefer to shut their eyes and enjoy the rem-



nants of pleasures which are left them, without disturbance. We shall be asked: Why speak of these things, unless there can be shown a remedy? There might be a remedy, if the people and their leaders were single-minded and honest in their action as citizens. The key-note of that remedy is in "impartial suffrage." In endeavoring to remedy the dangers of the commonwealth, we must remember that we are a conquered people, and have to obey our masters. Otherwise our straight road back to safety would be at once to repeal negro-suffrage. But our masters will not hear of that. What is called "impartial suffrage" is, however, permitted by their new Constitution. We should at once avail ourselves of that permission, and without attempting any discrimination on grounds of "race, color, or previous condition of bondage," establish qualifications both of property and intelligence for the privilege of voting. This would exclude the great multitude of negroes, and also a great many white men. And this last would of itself be no little gain, for many more white men have the privilege than use it for the good of the State. Again, the very misfortunes of the time give us this advantage now, for drawing back from the ultra-radicalism of our previous legislation: that the mass of white men are now so impressed with the dishonor and mischiefs of negro suffrage, the majority of those white voters having no property, would, even joyfully, surrender their privilege, tarnished and worthless as it is, if thereby the negro could be excluded. This constitutes our opportunity. To this saving reform there is just one real obstacle, and that is, *the timid self-interest of the office-seeking class*. I take it for granted that every sensible man in Virginia thinks in his heart that negro suffrage is a deplorable mistake. But many wish to be elected or appointed to office. These begin to calculate, under the promptings of timid selfishness: "While I should be very glad to see this wholesome reform, it will not be prudent for me to advocate it; because, should a movement for it, advocated by me, perchance fail, then all the classes whom that movement proposed to disfranchise of this useless and hurtful privilege, will be offended with me. So, when self-love desires to be elected to some place of emolument, they will remember me and vote against me. Hence, I cannot move in that reform, however desirable." *This is the real difficulty*, and the only real difficulty,

in the way of this blessed step towards salvation. If all the men who now cherish aspirations for office, could only be made to act disinterestedly—to forget self, to resolve to do the right and wise thing for the Commonwealth, whether they were ever voted for again or not, the whole thing would be easy. There are a plenty of intelligent young men in Virginia, now without property, who would joyfully join the freeholders in voting to disfranchise themselves for this great end, to make a commanding majority. So that the question, whether the State can be saved from this perdition, turns practically on this other question (as indeed the fate of Commonwealths always practically does), whether her people can for once act with a real honest disinterestedness. If the people and their leaders are capable of that, they can save themselves; if not capable, nothing can save them. And perhaps the verdict of posterity will be, that they were unworthy of being saved. It will be well for all to look this view of the matter fully in the face. Especially is it necessary for the farmers to see precisely where the deliverance and the obstacle to it lie.

The other branch of our remedy should be to reform our school system, both for blacks and whites, back towards the system of our fathers in Virginia, just as fast as possible. I mean the system which prevailed in Virginia up to 1860. I know that all the self-constituted, pretended advocates of free education disparage that system as miserably partial and inefficient. But our fathers knew what they were about, much better than was supposed. "Young people *think* old folks are fools, but old people *know* that young ones are." Did that old system produce perfect results? No. No system in imperfect human hands ever produces perfect results. Did it teach every adult in the State to read and write? No. *But neither will the new one.* That is, the new system will no more be able to overcome the inexorable law, that the mass of those addicted to manual labor will not and cannot addict themselves to the literary arts, than our fathers were. And after all the fuss and boast, and iniquitous expense, "the upshot" will be that *there will still be just as many adults in the State, who practically will not read, and who will forget how, as before.* And there will be far fewer to use their art of reading to any good purpose. How often will men stubbornly forget that *the art of*

*reading is not education*, but only a very uncertain *means of education*. With that class for which the free school especially provides, it is *usually a worthless means*. The feasible and useful education for that class is the development of faculties which takes place in learning how to make an honest living. My prediction is already verified in Massachusetts, the very home of the State-school humbug. *The annual reports of their own school superintendents confess it*. A large part of the rural laboring population, still do not read, have forgotten how to read, do not care to know, and care not a stiver whether their children know. (Here, by the way, is the cause of this new *furor* for "compulsory education"). Tried by this sober and truthful standard, I assert that the comparative fruits of our old system fully justified its excellence. Again I demand that the "tree shall be known by its fruits." That was the system which reared the Virginians of 1861: that glorious, enlightened generation of men, which comprehended so clearly the vital importance of the great doctrine of State sovereignty, while the Yankee hordes, reared up under this be-praised system of free schools, ignorantly trampled on it with beastly stupidity and violence: that glorious generation which contended for the right so firmly, so temperately, as to win the admiration of the world: that generation which, when moderation availed no longer, formed the heroic armies which followed Jackson and Lee to the last. Yes, it was the old Virginia system that reared the yeomanry which filled those immortal ranks with such a body of privates—so virtuous, so enduring, so brave, so intelligent, as no other generals ever commanded. Yes, "let the tree be known by its fruits." The tree that bore "the rank and file" of the Stonewall brigade was good enough for me. It may be pruned, it may be watered and tilled, and thus it may be improved. Our true wisdom will be to plant it again.

This old system evinced its wisdom by avoiding the pagan, Spartan theory, which makes the State the parent. It left the parent supreme in his God-given sphere, as the responsible party for providing and directing the education of his own offspring. This old plan, instead of usurping, encouraged and assisted, where assistance was needed. It was wise again, in that it avoided creating salaried offices to eat up the people's money, and yet do no actual teaching. It was supremely wise, in that

it cut the Gordian knot, "Religion in the State school," which now baffles British and Yankee wit. It set that insuperable difficulty clear on one side, by leaving the school as the creature of the parents, and not of the State. It was wise in its exceeding economy, a trait so essential to the State now.

I would have our rulers, then, avail themselves of another circumstance growing out of our calamities, to disarm the overweening zeal of the State school men. We can truthfully say to them: "Your system, whether best or not, is simply impracticable for Virginia. You see that she has stretched taxation to the verge of confiscation; and yet her debt cannot be paid and that costly system carried on." Let two separate "Literary funds," then, be created, one for whites and one for blacks, each separate, and each replenished from the taxation of its own class. Let "each tub stand upon its own bottom." Instead of the State undertaking to be a universal creator and sustainer of schools, let it invite parents to create, sustain, and govern their own schools under the assistance and guidance of an inexpensive and (mainly) unsalaried Board, and then render such help to those parents who are unable to help themselves, as the very limited school tax will permit. And let the existence of some aspiration in parents or children be the uniform condition of the aid; for without this condition it is infallibly thrown away. "One man may take a horse to water, but a hundred can't make him drink."

R. L. DABNEY.

Union Theological Seminary, Va., Feb. 21, 1876.

# THE STATE FREE SCHOOL SYSTEM IMPOSED UPON VIRGINIA BY THE UNDERWOOD CONSTITUTION.

---

DR. DABNEY,

---

He Has A Few Words to Say in Reply to Dr. Ruffner.

---

Repelling the Charge of Inconsistency—An Advocate of Universal Education, Provided it is True Education—The Old Virginia Plan—School Houses and Jails—Educated Criminals—A Few Comparative Figures—Drenching and Drinking—Home Education.

## I.

Hampden Sidney, Va., April 18, 1876.

*To W. H. Ruffner, Esq., Superintendent of State Schools:*

Dear Sir:—You have undesignedly done the cause of truth a service by so assailing the Virginia doctrines as advanced by me in the *Southern Planter* as to awaken the public curiosity to their defence. That defence I propose to continue in a brief reply to you by facts and arguments alone. I do not propose to follow you into any personalities. I am perfectly aware that my person is, to the people of Virginia, too unimportant for them to feel interested in a squabble over its consistency or credit. I presume that their feeling for your private person also is not very different. For an important principle they may care. While my humble sphere as a minister and teacher may render the great public indifferent to me personally, my employers and neighbors, who know me, need no defence of my personal credit from any disparagement from what quarter soever. They know that my position is thoroughly consistent and independent; that in my own education I never received from Church or State one dollar of eleemosynary aid; and that I have neither neglected nor abused any official trust committed to me.

You think it inconsistent in me to disapprove any free school because, you say, I am a professor in a "free school"—a theological seminary. This seminary is indeed truly "a free school." "I thank the Jew for that word." Founded and sustained by the *spontaneous, unforced gifts* of good men, it gives free tuition in divinity to young men *of all denominations*—even the most opposed to the donors—seeking the ministry. It is honestly and really a "free school"—supported by free gifts, attended by free, voluntary pupils. No penny of the salary of its teachers is exacted by the tax-gatherer from unwilling hands to pay for a project or an inculcation which they disapprove. Your "free schools," like not a few of the other pretensions of Radicalism, are in fact exactly opposite to the name falsely assumed. The great bulk of those who pay the money for them do it, not "freely," but by compulsion. They are virtually thrust down our throats by the bayonet. And the exemplars you most boast and imitate not only make the payment compulsory, but the attendance also, as your consistency will doubtless cause you to do in Virginia also in a few years. The only freedom of your system is *your freedom* to compel other people's money.

Your attacks on me breathe a great glorying in the strength of your party. Their tone seems to cry: "Oh, vain man; seest thou not that thou resistest the inevitable? With us are all Kaisers, and all demagogues, and all their minions, and all tax-gatherers, and all tax-consumers. Who art thou against so many?" Well, perhaps, nobody. But it is precisely in this that every prudent, reflecting Virginian sees the conclusive argument against your plan. Our true statesmen always taught us that government should not be allowed to go into any project aside from its direct, legitimate ends, especially if that project would subsidize many persons and create for them a motive of personal advantage to uphold it. Because whenever that project might be wrested to mischief, these interested motives might prevent a wholesome and necessary repeal. Such is precisely the case with your project. It has become mischievous and tyrannical, in that it forces on us the useless, impracticable, and dishonest attempt to teach literary arts to all negroes, when the State is unable to pay its debts and provide for its welfare, and has just been despoiled of its pos-

sessions by violence. And just so soon as a feeble voice is raised against this wrong, you flaunt before us this fact, that the vicious system has corrupted and subsidized so many minds that the friends of right are powerless! Why, this is the very demonstration that I am right. This is the crowning condemnation of your system.

You seem also to think I wrote with great severity. I did write with great severity in one sense. How came you to overlook the fact, which every dispassionate reader saw, that my severity was all aimed, not at Virginia, but at her conquerors and oppressors? Was it because you found yourself in fuller sympathy with those conquerors than with your oppressed fellow-citizens? Take heed, lest some, less your friends than I, should conclude so.

Notwithstanding your glorying, then, I mean once more to assert the unfashionable truth. Truth is never out of date. It has sometimes happened that a tentative experience has thrown so much light upon a bad system as to re-open the discussion with better guidance than the previous. If the American people, after enjoying this bepraised system, are so deficient in candor and intelligence that they cannot review and amend wrong action, this is sufficiently convictive of the worthlessness of the plan.

Let me also, at the outset, arrest all invidious outcry by saying that I am an advocate of the most universal education possible, provided it be true education. I heartily recognize all the teachings of the golden rule, of philanthropy, and of equality (so far as equality is righteous), which prompt us to desire for all our fellow-creatures, so far as possible, all the advantages of culture we value for ourselves—and that without distinguishing against classes. Let me say, once for all, *I am an advocate for the State's providing, if necessary, all the aid for poor children's schooling which is really desirable and will be really utilized by them—that is,* UPON THE OLD VIRGINIA PLAN. I wish to satisfy the most overweening by the express admission that universal education would be a good thing, were it practicable. The argument is that under that providential order which God has imposed upon society, the effectual literary education of all is impossible, and therefore the promise of it is delusive and mischeivous, and that when the State is an American demo-

cracy, especially, it is no safe or suitable agent for doing the work.

We begin by reasserting the familiar objection, so often contemptuously dismissed, that the principle upon which the State intrudes into the parental obligation and function of educating all children, is dangerous and agrarian. It is the teaching of the Bible and of sound political ethics that the education of children belongs to the sphere of the family and is the duty of the parents. The theory that the children of the Commonwealth are the charge of the Commonwealth is a pagan one, derived from heathen Sparta and Plato's heathen republic, and connected by regular, logical sequence with legalized prostitution and the dissolution of the conjugal tie. The dispensation of Divine Providence determines the social grade and the culture of children on their reaching adult age by the diligence and faithfulness of their parents, just as the pecuniary condition of children at that epoch is determined. The desire of procuring for their children a desirable condition in all these respects is the grand *stimulus* which Providence has provided for the efforts of parents. It is His ordination that youth shall inherit the *status* provided for them by their parents, and *improved it by their own exertions* as aided by the Christian philanthropy of their fellow-men. Now, by what apology does the State (not an evangelical, nor an eleemosynary institute by its nature) justify itself in stepping in to revolutionize that order? By the plea that it (the State) is so vitally interested in the intelligence of the citizens that this entitles her to take effectual means for preventing their ignorance. See, now, whither this assumption leads. The morality of the citizens is far more essential to the welfare of the State; and the only effectual basis for morals is the Christian religion. Therefore the State would be yet more bound to take order that all youth be taught Christianity. And this is just the argument by which Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Gladstone (before his political somersaults began) strenuously defended church establishments. Again, physical destitution of the citizens is as dangerous to the State as ignorance; therefore the State would be entitled to interfere for her own protection and repair that calamitous condition of destitution which their own and their parents' vices and laziness have entailed on a part of the people, by confiscating, for their relief, the honestly-



earned property of the virtuous and thrifty and their children. The last two inferences are precisely as fair as the first. Principles always bear their fruits; and the friends of this principle will in due time become consistent, and claim at least the last inference, along with the first. They are not likely to adopt the second, because the culture and ethics of the "common school" will leave them, after a time, too corrupt and atheistic to recognize the value of morality or its source—the Christian religion.

We often hear this apology for the State's wholesale intrusion into education advanced with the exactness of a commercial transaction. They say: "It costs less money to build school-houses than jails." But what if it turns out that the State's expenditure in school-house is one of the things which necessitates the expenditure in jails? The fruits of the system show that such is the result, and hence the plea for the State's intrusion is utterly delusive. The regular result of the kind of education which alone it can give is to propagate crime. Allison's History of Europe states that forty years ago two-thirds of the inhabitants of France could neither read nor write. In Prussia, at the same time, the government had made secular education almost universal, by compelling parents to send their children to school from seven to fourteen years of age. Statistics of the two countries show that serious crime was at that time *fourteen times as prevalent* in intelligent Prussia as in ignorant France—volume V., page 15. Again it has been found from the official records of the 86 departments of France that the amount of crime has, without a single exception, been in proportion to the amount of scholastic instruction given in each. Again, we are told that much the largest number of the lewd women of Paris come from those departments where there is most instruction. In Scotland the educated criminals are to the uneducated as four and a half to one. M. De Toqueville remarked of the United States that crime increased most rapidly where there was most instruction. The ancients testify that the moral condition of the "Barbarians" was comparatively pure beside that of the Greeks and Romans, and that the most refined cities were the most corrupt. But let us bring the comparison nearer home. The Northern States of the Union had previously to the war all adopted the system of universal State schools,

and the Southern States had not. In 1850 the former had thirteen and a half millions of people, and twenty-three thousand six hundred and sixty-four criminal convictions. The South (without State schools) had nine and a half millions, and two thousand nine hundred and twenty-one criminal convictions—that is to say, after allowing for the difference of population, the “educated” masses were something more than six times as criminal as the “uneducated.” The same year the North was supporting 114,700 paupers, and the South 20,500. The “unintelligent” South was something more than four times as well qualified to provide for its own subsistence as the “intelligent” North! But Massachusetts is the native home of the public school in America. In Boston and its adjacent county the persons in jails, houses of correction or refuge, and in alms-houses bore among the whites the ratio of one to every thirty-four. (Among the wretched, free blacks it was one to every sixteen.) In Richmond, the capital of “benighted” Virginia, the same unhappy classes bore the ratio of one to every one hundred and twelve. Such are the lessons of fact. Indeed, it requires only the simplest ocular inspection to convince any observer that the economical plea for State schools is illusory. In the South State school-houses were unknown, and consequently jails and penitentiaries were on the most confined and humble scale. The North is studded over with grand and costly public school-houses, and her jails are even more “palatial” in extent and more numerous than they.

All such promiscuous efforts to educate the whole masses by any secular authority must disappoint our hopes, and result in mischief, for a second reason. It finds its illustration in the homely proverb, that “while one man may lead a horse to water a hundred cannot make him drink.” True education, taken in any extent of its meaning, broad or narrow, is so greatly a moral process that a certain amount of aspiration and desire in its subject is an absolute prerequisite. The horse may be drenched, but that is not drinking; and the drench is not nourishment to be assimilated, but medicine. So, a knowledge of letters may be “exhibited” (as the medical men phrase it) to the resisting or apathetic mind; but there is no assimilation of the mental *pabulum* and no recruitment of spiritual strength. Something else must be first done, then, besides building and equipping a school

for souls which are in this State; and that is something which the State can never do—at least not by its schools. The moral aspiration and virtuous aims must be present, which alone will utilize a knowledge of letters. This is very plain. Now, it will be found generally true that in this country it is precisely the children of those who are presumed to need State education, and for whom the provision is chiefly designed, who are in this unprepared condition. If the State contained no children save those of parents who had the intelligence, the virtue, the aspiration, and also the property, or else the industry, which would make them resolved and able to educate their own, then, of course, it would be wholly superfluous for the Government to interfere. But these are the only children to whom letters are, in the general a real means of culture or elevation. Separate those who, in our fruitful land have neither aspiration, nor industry, nor property enough to insure that they will educate their own children, and in those children we usually find precisely that apathetic and hopeless condition, which renders this means nugatory, or worse. The parents are the real architects of their children's destiny, and the State cannot help it. There are, of course, exceptions. There are meritorious parents reduced by exceptional calamities to destitution, and there are a few "rough diamonds" unearthed in the unlikely mines of grovelling families. Such exceptions should be provided for; but wise legislators do not make universal systems to reach exceptional cases.

The law which we assert is accounted for by several practical causes. Parents who remain too poor and callous to educate their own children are so because they are ignorant, indolent, unaspiring, and vicious. The children's characters are usually as much the progeny of the parents as their bodies. Again: The aspiration, virtuous desire, and energy of the parents are absolutely essential to supply that impulse, which the child's mind requires to overrule its youthful heedlessness, and to impel it to employ and assimilate its otherwise useless acquisitions. And once more: The home education is so much more potential than that of the school, that the little *modicum* of training which a "common-school" system can give to the average masses is utterly trivial and impotent as a means of reversing the child's tendency. That which costs nothing is never valued. Old Judge

Buell, of Albany, placed a sack of a new variety of beautiful wheat upon the counter of the pavilion at a great agricultural fair, with a label inviting every farmer to take one quart as a gratuity, for seed. At night the sack was almost untouched. The old gentleman fretted at this result, took it the second day to the booth of a seeds man, and directed him to sell it at two dollars per quart. It was at once bought up greedily. One of the best teachers we ever knew determined to devote his latter years to the philanthropic work of teaching a gratuitous school for his neighbors. In a few months it had dwindled to five pupils, and died a natural death within a year. There is a natural humiliation also in being compelled to accept the provision of charity, or of the State, for that which conscience tells parents is obligatory on them. These reasons account for the fact, which the advocates of public schools so desire to hide, that the children do not attend, and the parents do not care to make them attend. He who goes "behind the scenes" in the Northern States knows how extensively this is true. *The rising movement for a "compulsory education" is a confession of this fact.* The unwilling disclosure of the failure of the system is the only thing this new movement will effect; for its folly is clear from this simple thought, that it contravenes, worse than all, the axiom: "One man can lead the horse to water," etc. Hence it results, that the class which is low enough to need this State aid, is one which usually cannot be elevated by it. But the abortive effort will awaken other influences, as we shall see, which are likely to make the children more miserable and less innocent than their ignorant parents.

Must the philanthropist, then, submit to the conclusion that ignorance and its consequences must needs be hereditary, and that knowledge, culture, and virtue are not to be extended beyond the fortunate youth for whom their parents secure them? We reply: this sad law does hold, and must hold to a far wider extent than our over-weening zeal is willing to acknowledge. Yet its rigor may be relaxed but not by the meddling of the civil magistrate or the arm of legislation. The agency must be social and Christian. The work must be done by laying hold of the sentiments, hearts, and consciences of parents and children together—not through their grammatical and arithmetical faculties. The agents for this blessed work are *the neighbor and*

*the church.* Christian charity and zeal, with the potent social influences descending from superiors to inferiors, in a society which is practically a kindly and liberal aristocracy; these may break the reign of ignorance and unaspiring apathy. The State cannot; the work is above its sphere.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. L. DABNEY.

## DR. DABNEY AGAIN.

---

Universal Education as Involving the Idea of the Leveller—All cannot Aspire to the Highest Stations—Manual Labor or Savagery the Destiny of the Major Part—Fancy Philanthropists—The Common School Alumni—Theological Quacks—A Little Learning a Dangerous Thing.

---

### II.

---

Hampden Sidney, Va., April 22, 1876.

*To W. H. Ruffner, Esq., Superintendent of State Schools:*

Dear Sir.—In the third place this theory of universal education in letters by the State involves the absurd and impossible idea of the Leveller, as though it were possible for all men to have equal destinies in human society. It is a favorite proposition with the asserters of these so-called American ideas, that “every American boy should improve himself as though he might some day be President of the United States.” That is to say, the system supposes and fosters a universal discontent with the allotments of Providence, and the inevitable graduations of rank, possessions and privilege. It is too obvious to need many words, that this temper is anti-Christian; the Bible, in its whole tone, inculcates the opposite spirit of modest contentment with our sphere, and directs the honorable aspiration of the good man to the faithful performance of its duties, rather than to the ambitious purpose to get out of it and above it. It may be asked, does not the Bible recognize that fact, so pleasing to every generous mind, that the lower ranks now and then produce a youth worthy of the highest? Yes, David was taken from the sheep-folds to be Israel’s most glorious king. But the Bible-idea is (and David’s was a case precisely in point) that the humble boy is to exhibit this fitness for a nobler destiny, not by discontent and greedy cravings, but by his exemplary performances in his lower lot; and that Providence and his fellow-citizens are

to call him to "come up higher." For these instances of native merit, which are usually few, the State has no need to legislate. They will rise of themselves. They cannot be kept down, provided only we do not legislate against them, but leave them the *carriere ouverte aux talents*; or, if they will be the better for any provision, it should be exceptional, as they are exceptional cases.

With this exception, it is utterly false that every American boy may aspire to the higher stations of life. In the lottery of life these prizes must be relatively few—only a few can reach them. Nor is it right or practicable to give to all boys an "even start" in the race for them. The State, of course, should not legislate to the disadvantage of any in this race; but we mean that Providence, social laws, and parental virtues and efforts, do inevitably legislate in favor of some classes of boys in their start in that race, and if the State undertakes to countervail that legislation of nature by levelling action, the attempt is wicked, mischievous, and futile. The larger part of every civilized people is, and ever will be, addicted to regular, manual labor. The idea that the diffusion of intelligence and improvement of the arts are so to lighten the doom of labor, that two or three hours' work daily will provide for the wants of all, and leave the lowest laborer the larger part of his day for intellectual pursuits, is a preposterous dream. Let experience decide. Does the progress of modern civilization tend to exact "shorter hours" of its laborers than the barbarous state? Human desires always outrun human means. If this Utopian era is ever to come, when two or three hours of the artisan's time will be worth a day's work, the artificial wants of him and his family will have outrun him, in demanding the expenditure of five or six days' wages in one. The laborer will still find a motive for working all day as now—unless he turn loafer! And the last words remind us, that the inexorable law of nature we have just pointed out is, on the whole, a beneficent one; for it is necessary to prevent mankind from abusing their leisure. The leisure conferred by wealth is now often abused. So would that secured for the poor, by this fancied wealth of intelligence, be yet more abused; and the six or eight hours redeemed from manual toil would be devoted, not to intellectual pursuits, but to wasteful and degrading vices. And these vices would soon rivet again the yoke of constant labor upon their necks, or the fetters of the jail or

house of correction. We repeat: The destiny of the major part of the human family is the alternative of manual labor or savagery.

Now, no people will ever connect a real pursuit of mental culture with the lot of constant manual labor. The two are incompatible. Neither time, nor taste, nor strength, nor energy of brain will be found for both. Have not all manual-labor schools been failures? The man that works all day (usually) does not study. The nerve-force has been expended in the muscles, and none is left for mental effort. Hence, we care not how universally the State may force the arts of penmanship and reading on the children of laborers, when these become laboring men they will cease to read and write; they will practically disuse the arts as cumbersome and superfluous. This is a fact at which your enthusiast for common schools is very loath to look; *but it is a stubborn one.* The laboring classes in States which profess to give a universal education do not make any more beneficial use of letters, than those elsewhere. Prussia has for more than a generation compelled all her peasantry to go to school; but she is full of middle-aged peasants who have forgotten how to read, and who, in fact, never read. In boasted Massachusetts herself the very superintendents of the free schools lament that the State has more than ever of laboring poor, especially among the agricultural laborers, who neither know nor care anything concerning letters, for themselves or their children. The deniers of these stubborn facts are only the flatterers, not the friends, of the laborers.

Again our fancy-philanthropist will raise his out-cry, that if these views are admitted they condemn more than half of our fellow-creatures to a Boeotian stupidity and mental darkness. We might answer, first, that his expedients are futile to reverse that doom. The only difference between him and us is, that he is too quixotic, or uncandid, or interested, to admit the fact. God has made a social sub-soil to the top-soil, a social foundation in the dust, for the superstructure—the utopian cannot unmake it, least of all by his patchwork. But there is a second answer; he forgets that *the use of letters is not education*, but only one means of education, and not the only means. The laboring classes find their appropriate mental and moral cultivation in their tasks themselves, and in the example and in-



fluence of the superiors for whom they labor. The plough-man or artisan cultivates his mental faculties most appropriately in acquiring skill and resource for his work. He trains the moral virtues by the fidelity and endurance with which he performs that work. He ennobles his taste and sentiments by looking up to the superior who employs him. If to these influences you add the awakening, elevating, expanding force of Christian principles, you have given that laborer a true education—a hundred fold more true, more suitable, more useful, than the communication of certain literary arts, which he will almost necessarily disuse. Let the reader recall that brilliant passage of Macaulay, as just as brilliant, in which he shows, against Dr. Johnson, that the Athenian populace, without books, was a highly-cultivated people. Let him remember how entirely the greatness of the feudal barons in the middle ages, was dissociated from all “clerkly arts;” yet they were warriors, statesmen, poets, and gentlemen. So, our own country presents an humbler instance in the more respectable of the African freedmen. Tens of thousands of these, ignorant of letters, but trained to practical skill, thought, and resource, by intelligent masters, and imitating their superior breeding and sentiments, present, in every aspect, a far “higher style of man” than your Yankee laborer from his common school, with his shallow smattering and purblind conceit, and his wretched newspaper stuffed with moral garbage from the police-courts, and with false and poisonous heresies in politics and religion. Put such a man in the same arena with the Southern slave from a respectable plantation, and in one week’s time the ascendancy of the Negro, in self-respect, courage, breeding, prowess and practical intelligence, will assert itself palpably to the Yankee and to all spectators. The slave was, in fact, the educated man.

Let it be granted, as we have just implied, that there is a certain use which this *alumnus* of the common school may continue to make of his knowledge of letters. This gives us our strongest argument. Then the common schools will have created a numerous “public” of readers one-quarter or one-tenth cultivated; and the sure result will be the production for their use of a false, shallow, sciolist literature, science, and theology, infinitely worse than blank ignorance. “Wheresoever the carcass is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.” This will

be the sure result of the law of supply and demand inspired by a mercenary spirit. Formerly literature was for the educated; it was their occupation, and they formed the constituency for whom the producers of literature labored; consequently the literature of the civilized nations was characterized by all that was most decent in manner, elevated in sentiment, and thorough and just in argument, of which their society could boast. The uneducated or quarter-educated formed no direct constituency for authors and publishers; they did not bid for them, or cater to them. These unlettered classes received their ideas of literary, political, philosophical, and theological subjects (the most ignorant virtually have their politics, philosophy, and theology), from their social superiors, through social channels. And this was a source much safer than the present "literature for the millions," because much higher, purer, and more disinterested. The consequence was, that the unlettered classes reflected the opinions, sentiments, and elevated tone of the uppermost *stratum*; now it is those of a class lower and more sordid than themselves. Thus the Southern overseer, who read little but his Bible, had a judgment infinitely better trained, a moral tone far higher, and a social, political, and religious creed far sounder than the modern *alumnus* of your "common school," with his Leveller's arrogance and envy, and his armful of cheap newspapers. The overseer had the landed gentry who employed him as his instructors and models, and through them drew his speculative opinions from the noblest minds of the South; the Crawfords, Cheves, Madisons, Barbours, Randolphs, Calhouns. The common-school *alumnus* has the wretched sciolists and theological quacks, who drive their sordid trade in cheap periodical literature. The advocates of the Yankee system boast in it, and revile the old one in that the latter made letters the prerogative of the few; theirs of the many. But letters of what sort? Here we have "given them a Roland for their Oliver."

We appeal to facts. Has not the creation of this large reading (but not truly educated) public occasioned a flood of mischievous, heretical, sciolistic, corrupting literature? The result is that the book and newspaper-making trade has, for sordid purposes, brought down to the lower classes a multitude of speculations on the most dangerous subjects, with which no mind is prepared to deal for itself and independently, until it is

very thoroughly trained and informed. That thorough mental discipline and full learning the common schools can never give to these masses. They may as well promise that every agrarian among them shall be an Astor or a Rothschild in wealth. The state of European and Yankee society under this new impulse illustrates the facts we assert. The smattering which State education has given the masses has but been to them the opening of Pandora's box. It has only launched them in an ocean which they are incompetent to navigate. Every manufactory is converted into a debating club, where the operatives intoxicate their minds with the most licentious vagaries of opinions upon every fundamental subject of politics and religion; and they have only knowledge enough to run into danger, without having a tenth part of the knowledge necessary to teach them their danger and incompetency. It was this system which prepared the way for the "International Society," and the horrors of the Paris *Commune*. So far are these nations from being healthily illuminated, they are an easy prey to the most destructive heresies, social and religious; and their condition is far more unwholesome and volcanic, with a more terrifying prospect of social dissolution, anarchy, and bloodshed, than was ever presented by the ignorance of the "middle ages." So obvious was this tendency to thoughtful minds thirty-five years ago that the great historian Heere, with his intimate acquaintance with all the defects of mediæval society, announced the deliberate opinion that the art of printing was destined to be more a curse than a blessing to Europe. It is not necessary for us to espouse that opinion; here is, at least, a fair instance for the application of the maxim of Pope, now so universally and disdainfully ignored:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing,  
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;  
For shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,  
But drinking deeply sobers us again."

The amount of this grave objection is that when the State interferes in the work of common school education, it inevitably does not enough, or too much. To give that large learning and thorough discipline necessary for setting the mind to deal inde-

pendently with the corrupt labyrinth of modern current opinion is beyond the State's power. What she does give usually prepares the victims for the literary seducers.

It is one of the most important and best established maxims of social science that *influence descends*. Hence, if you would permeate the whole popular mass with any wholesale influence, the wisest plan is to place the element of good at the top, that it may percolate downwards. The engineer, when he wishes to supply the humblest, lowliest lane or alley of a city with pure water, establishes his reservoir upon the topmost hill; and thence it descends, without any other force than its own gravity, to every door and every lip. So the most effectual, the most truly philanthropic mode for elevating the lower classes of society is to provide for the rise of the superior class. This is nature's process; she elevates the whole mass by lifting it from above so that all the parts rise together, preserving that relation of places on whose preservation the whole organism depends. The fashionable plan is to place the lever under the bottom stones and prize them to the level of the cap-stones of which the result is that the whole structure tumbles into rubbish. The establishment of the University of Virginia for giving the most thorough training to advanced scholars has been the most truly liberal measure for the cultivation of the masses ever adopted in the State. It teaches only a few hundred of young men, and those only in the highest studies? True, but in giving them a higher standard of acquirement it has elevated as well as multiplied all the teachers of every grade; making the instruction better, down to the primary schools where the children of the poor learn the rudiments of reading. And what is better still, it has made thorough culture respectable, and diffused honest aspirations to the lowest ranks. Your very obedient servant,

R. L. DABNEY.

ANOTHER DABNEY BOLT FOR DR. RUFFNER'S BENEFIT.

---

Overweening Philanthropists—Decent and Vile Children—The Danger of Disease—What Dr. Dabney Thinks of Southern Negroes as Compared with Northern Poor Whites—Demagogues and Politicians and Their Relation to the Free School System—The Testimony of Webster, Not the Dictionary Man—An Alternative Horrible to Contemplate.

---

III.

---

Hampden Sidney, Va., April 25, 1876.

*To W. H. Ruffner Esq., Superintendent of State Schools:*

Dear Sir.—In the objections thus far set forth there are premises which, however true and impregnable, are now so unfashionable that with many they will meet no response but an angry outcry. The application of them would demolish so many vain idols, now much cherished, that the writer cannot hope for a hearing even, from many minds. Time must be the only teacher for these overweening philanthropists. When they are taught by him that this system of State education has utterly failed to produce the benefits they designed, and has fixed on us the mischiefs above described, they will learn that these are the words of truth and soberness. But we purpose to present three other points of objection not involving the principles expounded in the previous part of this discussion, more practical and indisputable; and either one of these is sufficient for the utter condemnation of the system.

The first is, that if a system of universal common schools is to be carried out in good faith, there must be a mixture of the children of the decent and the children of the vile in the same society during the most plastic age. The boast is: that the ed-

ucation is to be for all, and most prominently for the lowest and most ignorant, because they need it most. Then, if this boast is to be faithfully realized, all the moral lepers among the children of a given district must be thrust into the society of our children at school. In order to receive the shallow *modicum* of letters there dispensed, they must be daily brought into personal contact with the cutaneous and other diseases, the vermin—(Yes, dear reader, it is disgusting! We would spare you if faithfulness permitted; but the foulness belongs to the plan, not to us)—the obscenity, the profanity, the groveling sentiments, the violence of the *gamins*, with which our boasted material civilization teems in its more populous places. This must be done, too, at the tender and imitative age of childhood. The high, sacred prerogative of the virtuous parent to choose the moral influences for his own beloved offspring must be sacrificed to this ruthless, levelling idol. Every experienced teacher knows that pupils educate each other more than he educates them. The thousand nameless influences—literary, social, moral—not only of the play-ground but of the school-room, the whispered conversation, the clandestine note, the sly grimace, the sly pinch, the good or bad recitation, mould the plastic character of children far more than the most faithful teacher's hand.

Now, there are some quarters of our towns and cities, and some rural neighborhoods, where this difficulty is little felt; either because the limited population is nearly homogeneous, or because the poor are decent and virtuous. Especially has the latter case been realized in many country communities of the South, where such was the cleanliness, propriety, good breeding, and moral elevation of the poorer families, imbibed from their kindly dependence on cultivated superiors, that a neighborhood school could be made to include all the white children, without serious injury to the morals of any. But the levelling policy, of which State common schools are a constituent member, now claims to make the blacks equal, socially and politically, to the most reputable whites. Against the collection of white children into the same public schools with Negroes, the very principle which we are illustrating, has made a protest so indignant and determined that, although the protest of the conquered, it has been heard in all the Southern States, except Louisiana. The refusal to hear it there resulted in the absolute

banishment of the children of the white citizens from the schools supported by their money. And this protest has not been, as the enemy and conqueror deems it, the mere expression of caste-prejudice, but the conscientious demand of the natural right to our children from moral contamination. Here, then, we have a broad, a recognized application of this potent objection to the State system. The whole Southern people make the objection; nearly all the friends of State education admit its force in this case. But on this conceded case there are two remarks to be made. First, the concession is inconsistent with the whole theory of State schools and of the levelling system to which they belong. This is so clearly felt, that even now the determined advocates of State education are candid enough to foreshadow the withdrawal of the concession, speaking of it as an arrangement "necessary for the time being." Is it your opinion that this concession should be yielded to us temporarily or permanently? Do you think that it should be withdrawn after a little, when all the staunch old Confederates like me have died out; or that the Negroes should never be admitted to the same schools as the whites? Yankeedom and Negroedom are listening for your consistent answer. Second. The Southern Negroes are a less degraded and vicious race than many large elements of the white poor, who, in parts of the North, have free entrance into the common schools there. Indeed, the force of the social objection is felt and acted on by numbers of the Northern people. Many are the blatant advocates of the system among the people of property, who yet dream not of sending their own children to the common schools. They consult their popularity by pretending to advocate the system; and yet, for their own offspring, they will not so much as touch it with a tip of their fingers. And many are the Phariasaic negrophobists who berate and revile the Southern people for resisting this abhorrent amalgamation of their children with blacks; who would flout with foul scorn the proposal to send their own pampered brats to the common school near them along with the children of their poor white neighbors.

Sometimes it is asked, "How are the degraded classes to be elevated if they are thus to be denied all association with those better than themselves?" We reply that while we fully recognize the Christian duty of seeking the degraded and of drawing

them up to purer associations, we beg leave to demur against employing our innocent and inexperienced children as the missionaries. The braving of this moral contagion is the proper work of mature men and women of virtue; and these are to elevate their beneficiaries by holding to them the relation of benevolent superiors, not of comrades and equals in school-room and play-ground. It is claimed that it is the teacher's part to prevent those "evil communications which corrupt good manners." We reply that it is impossible; he would need more than the hundred hands of Briareus and the hundred eyes of Argus, with more moral fidelity than falls to the share of any save apostles and martyrs. Is the pittance paid to a common-school teacher likely to purchase all these splendid endowments? It is said that if a fastidious parent does not like the social atmosphere of the common school he may pay for a more select private one. But he is taxed compulsorily to support this school which parental duty forbids him to use; so that the system in this case amounts to an iniquitous penalty upon him for his faithfulness to his conscience. What clearer instance of persecution could arise? Once more it is sneeringly asked: "Have children's morals never been corrupted in private schools?" They have, alas, often been. But this only shows our argument stronger instead of weaker; for it proves that parental vigilance as to the moral atmosphere of the children's comrades needs to be greatly increased; while this system insists upon extinguishing all such conscientious watchfulness, and provides the punishment of a mulct for its exercise.

The second objection is yet more damning as against the system of State schools in this country. They are, and will inevitably be, wielded by the demagogues, who are in power for the time, in the interests of their faction. Here is a danger and a curse which must not be estimated by the results of the system in any other country, such as Scotland or Prussia. In the former kingdom the Presbyterian system of parochial schools gave what was virtually a national primary education. But it was not obnoxious to this perversion to factious uses. Scotland is a little country, and was then almost absolutely homogeneous in religion and politics; the government was a stable, hereditary monarchy, of the change of which there was neither possibility nor desire; the schools were controlled by the parish clergy and



kirk sessions, parties whose attitude was at once independent, and dissociated from political objects and managers. In Prussia, also, we see a permanent military monarchy ruling the people with a uniformity and resistless power which has hitherto left no hope to the demagogue. It is very true that this monarchy does manipulate the State schools in the interest of its own perpetuity, and in doing so inflicts on the minds of the people no little injury. But the wrong thus done is as white as snow compared with pitch, when set against the foul perversions wrought by our demagogues in power. For an old, stable monarchy is always infinitely more decent and moderate than a democratic faction in America rioting on the spoils of party success. The teachings of the monarchy, if self-interested, are at least conservative and consistent; and they include a respectable knowledge of the Christian religion. It will be utterly delusive, therefore, to argue for the value of State common schools from Scotland or Prussia. Our demagogues will take effectual care that our schools shall not yield us even the mixed fruits which those nations have reaped from theirs.

For what is it on which American politicians do not lay their harpy hands to get or to keep the spoils of office? On the offices themselves, which the law has instituted for the public service; on finance; on commerce; on the railroads; on the productive industries of the citizens; on taxation; on our holy religion itself! And, like the harpies, whatever they touch they contaminate! That the school system of the States is perverted to factions and sordid ends is so notorious that we shall not insult the intelligence of our readers by many testimonies. Has not the supreme official of the school system in the State of Indiana, for instance, been seen to publish to the world his unblushing boast that he had successfully arrested the whole machinery to inculcate upon all the children of that State the malignant and lying creed of Radicalism? And this man, after satisfying his masters, the Radical Legislature, of his success in placing this gospel of hate and murder, and these utter falsifications of history and fact and constitutional law, in the tender hand of every child in Indiana, only intimates, in the most gingerly and apologetic way, a faint inclination to give them the Word of God: which yet, he hastens to assure them, he had not presumed to attempt! Again, these omnipotent school

boards, under the plausible pretext of uniformity of text-books, enter into alliances with capitalists who are publishers of books (for what solid consideration, who can tell?), giving them the monopoly of manufacturing American history, ethics and politics for the children of a whole State, without leaving any option to the parent. This single feature, presented by the alliance of the "Book-Trade" with the Education Boards, is sufficient to condemn the whole in the judgment of every independent mind. If it is not corrected the liberty of the citizens is gone. In some of those Southern States where the Conservatives have been so fortunate as to retain control of the State governments the advocates of State education are openly heard attempting, in their new-born zeal, to reconcile the people to the measure forced upon them by promising that it shall be so manipulated as to train the next generation of negroes to vote with the Conservatives. Now the temptation of the oppressed to foil their oppressors may be very strong; and they may be inclined to be rather unscrupulous in the means of defense against enemies so unscrupulous and abhorred as the carpet-bag horde. It may be very alluring to us to employ this tyrannical system, which is forced upon us against our will, to the ruin of its inventors, and thus to "hoist the engineer with his own petard." But the foreseeing man cannot but remember that it is a dangerous force which is employed, and that on any change of the faction in power what we hope to make sauce to the (Radical) goose may become sauce to the (Conservative) gander. It is a hazardous game for good people to attempt to "fight the devil with fire."

This perversion of a pretended system of education is as intolerable as it is certain. It is hard enough to have a triumphant faction rule us in a mode which outrages our sense of equity and patriotism—shall they also abuse their power to poison the minds of our own children against the principles which we honor, and to infect them with the errors which we detest? Is it not enough that our industries must all be burdened and our interests blighted by the selfish expedients of demagogues grasping after power and plunder? Must the very souls of our children be made merchandise and trafficked with in the same hateful cause? What freemen can endure it? These practices have already disclosed their destructive fruits in preparing a

whole generation, by a pupilage of lies, for a war of plunder and subjugation against the South. For years before the war the sectional and aggressive party had control of the State education in New England and the Northwest. They used their opportunity diligently; and the result was that when the chance to strike came, they had a whole generation trained to their purpose in hatred of the South and in constitutional heresies. Such was the testimony of Daniel Webster. Two gentlemen from Virginia—old collegemates of mine—were visiting Washington during Mr. Filmore's administration. Webster's return towards an impartial course had then gained him some respect in the South, and my two friends paid their respects to him. While conversing with them he fixed his dark eyes on them, and with great earnestness asked: "*Can't* you Southern gentlemen consent, upon some sort of inducement or plan, to surrender slavery?" They replied firmly: "Not to the interference or dictation of the Federal Government. And this not on account of mercenary or selfish motives, but because to allow outside interference in this vital matter would forfeit the liberties and other rights of the South." "Are you fixed in that?" asked Webster. "Yes, unalterably." "Well," he said, with an awful solemnity, "I cannot say you are wrong, but if you are fixed in that, go home and get ready your weapons." They asked him what on earth he meant. He replied, that the parsons and common-school teachers and school-marms had diligently educated a whole Northern generation into a passionate hatred of slavery, who would, as certainly as destiny, attack Southern institutions. So that if Southern men were determined not to surrender their institutions they had better prepare for war. Thus, according to Mr. Webster, the crimes, woes, and horrors of the last fifteen years are all partly due to this school system. The only condition in which free government can exist is amidst the wholesome competition of two great constitutional parties, who watch and restrain each other. The result of this system of State schools is that the successful party extinguishes its rival, and thus secures for itself an unchecked career of usurpation. For it aims to extinguish all the diversity and independence which the young would derive from parental inculcation, and to imprint upon the whole body of coming citizens its own monotonous type of political heresies and

passions. This is virtually done in America. For the Northern Democratic party is only a little less radical than the Radicals, and really separated from them chiefly by the craving for party spoils. If the triumphant faction, wielding this power of universal education, happens to be one as able, patriotic, and honest as the party of Knox and Melville, then there may result the marvelous homogeneity and thrift of Presbyterian Scotland. But the ascendant faction may happen to be a ruthless and unprincipled Radicalism, armed with this power of universal corruption of future opinion and morals! And what then? *All is lost*; the remaining alternatives are Chinese civilization, or savagery. Your very obedient servant, R. L. DABNEY.

## DR. DABNEY'S BATTERY.<sup>1</sup>

---

### HE OPENS FIRE ON DR. RUFFNER FROM ANOTHER QUARTER.

---

His Fourth Letter—The Bible in the Public Schools—The Difficulty not Limited to America—Is Religious Training Essential?—The Human Spirit a Monad—The Duty of Parents.

---

#### IV.

---

*Hampden Sidney, Va., May 4, 1876.*

To W. H. Ruffner, Esq., Superintendent of State Schools:

Dear Sir.—The third objection to education by the State is, if possible, more conclusive still. It is one which looms up already in such insuperable dimensions that we freely acknowledge the hope that the whole system may be wrecked by it at an early day. This is the difficulty, especially for American Commonwealths, of the religious question. What religion shall be taught to the children by the State's teachers as the necessary part of the education of reasonable and moral beings? We have only to mention the well-known facts that the citizens of these American States are conscientiously divided among many and rival sects of religion, and that our forms of government tolerate no union of Church and State, and guarantee equal rights to all men irrespective of their religious opinions, to show to any fair mind how impossible it is for the advocates of universal State education to do more than evade the point of the difficulty. It has been made familiar to every reader of the newspapers in America by recent events in this country—in New York, in Cincinnati, and elsewhere. The teaching of King James's version of the Christian Scriptures even has led to violent protest and even to actual riot and combat. The most numerous and determined complainants are, of course, Roman Catholics; but the Jews, now becoming increasingly numerous and influential, and the Unitarians and Deists must

---

<sup>1</sup>—Appeared in *Richmond Enquirer*.

claim similar grounds of protest. Their argument is that this version of the Scriptures is, in their sincere judgment, erroneous; and therefore they cannot conscientiously permit it to be taught to their children. But as they are taxed to support these schools, they cannot be justly perverted to teach their children an obnoxious creed without a virtual establishment of the Protestant religion at public expense; which is an outrage against the fundamental principles and laws of the State. The special advocates of the common schools, who are usually also zealous Protestants, try hard to flout this objection as captious. But while we are very far from being Romanists in religion, we feel that this difficulty cannot be justly disposed of in this way. If the State, through its teachers, taught the children of us Protestants that version of the Bible which makes the Redeemer say: "Except ye do penance ye shall all likewise perish," we should make a determined resistance. No power on earth would force us to acquiesce in such inculcation of what we devoutly believe to be religious error. And we should feel that it was an inexcusable injustice to tax us for the purpose of teaching to our beloved children what we could not, at the peril of our souls, permit them to learn. Now, the common-school advocates of New York and of Ohio would say, our objection is just, because the Latin vulgate is really an erroneous translation; the objection of the Romanists is unjust because King James's is a substantially correct version of God's word. As theologians, and in an ecclesiastical *arena*, we assert that this is true; and are confident that we can establish it. But this is not the point. We have covenanted that in our political relations as citizens of the Commonwealth, all shall have equal rights irrespective of their religion. In that sphere we are bound to be impartial; "our word is out." The very point of the covenant is, that so far as civic rights and privileges go, our Romanist fellow-citizens' opinions (erroneous though we deem them, in our religious judgment) shall be respected precisely as they are required to respect ours. The weight of the Romanist protest, then, cannot be consistently evaded by American republicans.

This difficulty is not limited to our democratic land. In Great Britain and Ireland, where the government is moving for national education, all the denominations of Christians are hopelessly involved in it. For the settlement of this matter,

there are, if the State educates, but three possible alternatives. One is to force the religion of the majority on the children of the minority of the people. The injustice of this has already been proved. A second solution is what the British call the plan of "concurrent endowment." It consists in aiding the citizens of different religions to gather their children in separate schools, in which religious instruction may be given suited to the views of the parents, and all paid for by the State alike. The clamors of the Romanists in New York have been partially appeased by acts falling virtually under this plan. The city government, in view of the fact that Romanists cannot conscientiously send their children to schools which they are taxed to support, make appropriations of public money to some of their schools, which are in every respect managed after their own religious ideas. This "concurrent endowment" is justly as odious to the great Protestant body, both in this country and Great Britain, as any plan could be. It offers its seeming solution only in places populous enough in the several rival religions to furnish materials for a school to each. In all other places it makes no provision for the difficulty. It is a dereliction from principle in a State prevalently Protestant in its population thus to place contradictory systems of belief upon a complete legislative equality, teaching both alike, when the truth of the one inevitably implies the falsehood of the other. It outrages the rights of Protestants by expending a part of the money they pay in propagating opinions which they regard as false and destructive, and it gives to erroneous creeds a pecuniary and moral support beyond that which they draw from the zeal and free gifts of their own votaries. For these reasons the plan of "concurrent endowment" is reprobated by all the stronger denominations on both sides of the Atlantic. The Irish and American Catholics profess to approve it, because they expect to gain something by it, but most inconsistently. Who dreams that if they held the power, and were in the majority in either the British or Yankee empire (as in the French), they would be willing to see "good Catholic money" appropriated by the State to teach "Protestant heresies?"

The third alternative proposed is, to limit the teaching of the State schools in every case to secular learning, leaving the parents to supply such religious instruction as they see fit in

their own way and time, or to neglect it wholly. Of this solution no Christian of any name can be an advocate. We have seen how utterly the Pope and his prelates reprobate it. All other denominations in Europe regard it as monstrous; and indeed no adherent of any religion can be found in any other age or country than America who would not pronounce it wicked and absurd for any agency undertaking the education of youth to leave their religious culture an absolute blank. Testimonies might be cited to weariness; we will satisfy ourselves with a few, two of which are of peculiar relevancy, because drawn from unwilling witnesses, earnest advocates of State schools. In an annual meeting of the Teachers' Association of the State of Maryland a well-considered piece was read by a prominent member, in which the immense difficulty of the religious question in State schools was fairly displayed. The author, on the one hand, admitted that the rights of conscience of parents could not be justly disregarded. He held, on the other, that a schooling devoid of moral and religious teachings ought to be utterly inadmissible. The best solution he could suggest was, that the State should get up a course of moral and theological dogmas for its pupils, embracing only those common truths in which all parties are agreed, and excluding every truth to which any one party took exception. And he admitted that, as we have Protestants, Papists, Unitarians, Jews, Deists, etc., (not to say Mormons and the heathen Chinese), the Bible and all its characteristic doctrines must be excluded! It is too plain that when the State school's creed had been pruned of every proposition to which any one party objected, it would be worthless and odious in the eyes of every party, and would be too emasculated to do any child's soul a particle of good.

In a meeting of the Educational Association of Virginia four years ago a pious and admirable paper was read by one of the most eminent citizens in the State (Dr. J. B. Minor) on this theme: "Bible instruction in schools." After some *exordium* it begins thus: "It must be acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable phenomena of our perverted humanity that among a Christian people, and in a Protestant land, such a discussion should not seem as absurd as to inquire whether school-rooms should be located *under water* or in *darksome caverns*. The Jew, the Mohammedan, the follower of Confucius



and of Brahma, each and all are careful to instruct the youth of their people in the tenets of the religions they profess, and are not content until, by direct and reiterated teaching, they have been made acquainted with at least the outline of the books which contain, as they believe, the revealed will of Deity. Whence comes it that Christians are so indifferent to a duty so obvious, and so universally recognized by Jew and Pagan?" The absolute necessity of Bible instruction in schools is then argued with irresistible force. Yet, with all this, such is the stress of the difficulty which we are pressing, it betrays this able writer into saying: "I do not propose to allude to the agitating question of the introduction of the Scriptures into *public schools* conducted under authority of government." But why not? If other schools so imperatively need this element of Bible instruction, why do not the State schools? Its necessity is argued from principles which are of universal application to beings who have souls. Why shall not the application be made to all schools? Alas! the answer is: the right conclusion *cannot* be applied to State schools. We claim, then, this is a complete demonstration that the State is unfit to assume the educational function. The argument is as plain and perfect as any that can be imagined. Here is one part which is absolutely essential to the very work of right education: the State is effectively disabled from performing that part. Then the State cannot educate, and should not profess it. The argument is parallel to this: In order to be a country physician it is essential that one shall ride in all weathers. A. cannot ride in bad weather. Then A. cannot be a country physician, and if he is an honest man he will not profess to be.

Whether the religious training is essential to all right education, let us hear a few more witnesses. Said Daniel Webster, in the Girard will-case, commenting on the exclusion of clergymen from the proposed orphan college: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere; never. Everywhere, and at all times, it has been and is regarded as essential. *It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction*" Says Sir Henry Bulwer: "I do not place much confidence in the philosopher who pretends that the knowledge which develops the passions is an instrument for their suppression, or that where

there are the most desires there is likely to be the most order and the most abstinence in their gratification." The historian Froude (a witness by no means friendly to orthodoxy), quoting Miss Nightingale, a philanthropist as Christian as wise, emphatically endorses her opinion, that the ordinary and natural effect of the communication of secular knowledge to youths whose destiny is labor is only to suggest the desire for illicit objects of enjoyment. Says Dr. Francis Wayland: "Intellectual cultivation may easily exist without the existence of virtue or love of right. In this case its only effect is to stimulate desire; and this unrestrained by the love of right must eventually overturn the social fabric which is at first erected." Hear John Locke: "It is virtue, then, direct virtue, which is the hard and valuable part to be aimed at in education. \* \* \* If virtue and a well-tempered soul be not got and settled so as to keep out ill and vicious habits, languages, and science, and all the other accomplishments of education, will be to no purpose *but to make the worse or more dangerous man.*"

We propose now to substantiate these views of the wise and experienced, by arguing that tuition in Christianity is essential to all education which is worth the name. And we claim more than the admission that each man should at some stage of his training, and by somebody, be taught Christianity; we mean in the fullest sense that Christianity must be a present element of all the training at all times, or else it is not true and valuable education. Some one may say that this broad proposition is refuted at the outset by frequent instances of persons who received, at least during a part of their youth, a training perfectly non-Christian, and who yet are very useful, and even Christian citizens. The answer is easy: It is the prerogative of a merciful Providence, and the duty of His children, to repair the defects and misfortunes of His creatures and to bring good out of evil. But surely this comes far short of a justification for us if we willingly employ faulty methods which have a regular tendency to work evil. Surely it is not our privilege to make mischief for God and good Christians to repair!

Let the candid reader, then, ponder the weight of these facts. The human spirit is a *monad*, a single, unit, spiritual substance, having facilities and susceptibilities for different modifications, but no parts. Hence, when it is educated it is

educated as a unit. The moral judgments and acts of the soul all involve an exercise of reason; so that it is impossible to separate the ethical and intellectual functions. The conscience is the supreme, directive faculty of the soul; so that knowledge bears to moral action the relation of means to end. Man fulfills the ends of his existence, not by right cognitions, but by right moral actions. Hence we are obviously correct in holding that the fundamental value of right cognitions is simply as they are the means of right moral acts—that is, the knowledge is really valuable *only as it is in order to right actions*. Again: The nature of responsibility is such that there can be no neutrality, or *tertium quid*, between duty and sin. “He that is not with his God is against him.” He who does not positively comply with the ever-present obligation does *ipso facto* violate it, and contract positive sinfulness. Hence as there cannot be in any soul a *non-Christian* state which is not *anti-Christian*, it follows that any training which attempts to be non-Christian is therefore anti-Christian. God is the rightful, supreme master and owner of all reasonable creatures, and their nearest and highest duties are to him. Hence to train a soul away from him is a robbery of God, which he cannot justify in any person or agency whatsoever. He has not, indeed, committed to the State the duty of leading souls to him as its appropriate task. This is committed to the family and to his church. Yet it does by no means follow that the State may do anything tending to the opposite. The soul is essentially active, and every human being in his active powers of moral desire, volition and habit, is unavoidably exercising himself. Hence, whatever omission or neglect may be practiced as to the formation of a character, every character does inevitably form itself, for evil if not for good! Remember, also, that evil example is omnipresent in the world, and the disposition to respond to it is innate in every child. How obvious, then, that a “let-alone policy” as to the moral development must, to a greater or less degree, amount to a positive development of vicious character? Not to row is, itself, to float down the stream. Once more: the discipline of one set of faculties may leave other faculties inert and undeveloped. This result is, then, more than a negative mischief, because the balance or proportion of the character is then more perverted. Should the branches and

leaves of a tree continue to grow while the roots remained stationary it would result in the destruction of the tree, and this although the roots contracted no positive disease or weakness. The first gale would blow it over in consequence of the disproportion of its parts. In this view the conclusion cited above from Sir H. Bulwer and Mr. Froude is seen to be perfectly just. With the increase of knowledge temptations must increase. Wider circles of imagined enjoyments are opened to the desires, so that if the virtuous habitude is not correspondingly strengthened, criminal wishes and purposes will be the sure result. He who has criminal purposes is, moreover, by his knowledge equipped with more power to execute them. Locke's conclusion is just. In the words of Dr. Griffin, to educate the mind without purifying the heart is but "to place a sharp sword in the hand of a madman." Our last proposition of these premises is that practically the Bible is the source and rule of moral obligation in this land. By this we do not mean to decide that even an atheist, not to say a disbeliever in inspiration, might not be still obliged from his principles to recognize the imperative force of conscience in his own reason, if he would philosophize correctly. But practically few do recognize and obey conscience except those who recognize the authority of the Bible. This book is, in point of fact, the source from which the American people draw their sense of obligation, and of its metes and bounds, so far as they have any. This is especially true of children. Grant the inspiration of the Bible, and we have a basis of moral appeal so simple and strong that practically all other bases are comparatively worthless, especially for the young. Its moral histories have an incompatible adaptation to the popular and the juvenile mind. The Bible alone applies to the heart and conscience with any distinct certainty the great forces of future rewards and punishments and the powers of the world to come. And, above all, it alone provides the purifying influences of redemption.

There can be, therefore, no true education without moral culture, and no true moral culture without Christianity. The very power of the teacher in the school-room is either moral or it is a degrading, brute force. But he can show the child no other moral basis for it than the Bible. Hence my argument is as perfect as clear. The teacher must be Christian. But the

American Commonwealth has promised to have no religious character. Then it cannot be teacher. If it undertakes to be, it must be consistent, and go on and unite Church and State. Are you ready to follow your opinions to this consistent end?

Since religious education is so essential a part, it is obvious that a wise Providence must have allotted the right and duty of giving it to some other of the independent spheres between which he has distributed the social interests of man. *This duty rests with the parent.* Such is the Protestant doctrine—the Bible doctrine. Neither State nor Church are to usurp it; but both are to enlighten, encourage and assist the parent in his inalienable task.

A feeble attempt has been made to escape this fatal objection by saying: Let the State schools teach secular knowledge, and let the parents, in other places and times, supplement this with such religious knowledge as they please and by the help of such Church as may please them. The fatal answers are: 1st. The secular teacher depends for the very authority to teach upon the Bible. 2d. The exclusion of the Bible would put a stigma on it in the child's mind which the parent cannot afterwards remove. 3d. How can one teach history, ethics, psychology, cosmogony, without implying some religious opinions? 4th, and chiefly: The parents who are too poor, ignorant, and delinquent to secure their children secular schooling will, by the stronger reason, be sure to neglect their religious education. But these are the parents whose deficiencies give the sole pretext for the State's interference, so that the one-sided training which the State leaves merely secular will remain so in all these cases. But these cases give to the State common school its sole *raison d'être*.

I conclude, therefore, that in a country like America, at least, your favorite system is inapplicable, and will work only mischief. Our old Virginia system, besides its economy, has these great logical advantages: that it leaves to parents, without usurpation, their proper function as creators or electors of their children's schools, and that it thus wholly evades the religious question, which is, to you, insoluble. Government is not the creator but the creature of human society. The Government has no mission from God to make the community; on the contrary, the community should make the Government. What

the community shall be is determined by Providence, where it is happily determined by far other causes than the meddling of governments—by historical causes in the distant past—by vital ideas propagated by great individual minds—especially by the Church and its doctrines. The only communities which have had their characters manufactured for them by their governments have had a villainously bad character—like the Chinese and the Yankees. Noble races make their governments; ignoble ones are made by them.

I remain your very obedient servant,

R. L. DABNEY.

## SECULARIZED EDUCATION.<sup>1</sup>

---

Who is the agent entitled to control education? What is right education? These questions are interdependent. Two answers have been proposed to the first in history: The State, the Church. In Europe, Liberalism says the State, and insists on secularizing education, by which it means its release from the control of popery. Liberals see clearly that, under that control, there will be no true freedom. But, as they also insist on secularizing the State, their idea of a free education is of one devoid of religion, separating the mental from the spiritual culture. Thus they conclude that education must be Godless, in order to be free. Rome has herself to blame for this error, as for most of European scepticism. She claims that she alone is Christian: independent minds reply, "Then Christianity is evil." So if her education were the only Christian, free-men would have to reject Christian education. If private judgment is sin; if the hierarchy is the Church; if the teacher is a real priest and essential "proxy" between men and salvation; if his teaching is infallible; if the real end of the culture is to enslave the soul to a priesthood with a foreign head; if that head is absolutely superior to the secular sovereignty, such ecclesiastical education will be civil slavery. It is not strange that men seeking civil liberty spurn it.

The mistake is in confounding ecclesiastical with Christian education. Let the Scripture be heard: "The kingdom of God is within you," consisting, not in a greedy hierarchy, but in the rule of Truth; the clergy are not lords over God's heritage, but only "ministers by whom we believe"; it has no penalties but the spiritual, reaching no man's civil rights; its only other function is didactic, and its teaching only hinders so far as the layman's own conscience responds; it is the Church's duty to instruct parents how God would have them rear their children,

---

<sup>1</sup>—Appeared in *Libby's Princeton Review*.

and enforce the duty by spiritual sanctions; but there its official power ends. It does not usurp the doing of the important task it inculcates. As a Christian private man the minister lends other parents his knowledge and virtues to co-operate in their work. But all this implies no danger either to spiritual or religious liberty.

But it will be well for the modern Liberal to pause and ask whether he secures anything by this transfer of the educating function from Church to State? Does he point to the results of Jesuit teaching, spurious, shallow scholarship, an enslaved and morbid conscience, which dares not even wish to break its fetters, the insatiable greed of the hierarchy for influence and money, the hateful perversion of the sacred task to inspire falsehood and prejudice for this end? The picture is sufficiently repulsive. But are only ecclesiastics grasping? Is human nature depraved? Is it essentially the same in all men? Then why are they not to be expected to act in similar ways, when subjected to the same temptations? And the modern Liberal is the last man to overlook this truth; since he is sceptical of all professions of spiritual principles in clergymen, and prone to ascribe secular motives. He should, then, expect the demagogue to show a misguided ambition exactly like the priests. What is the hierarch but a ghostly demagogue? The demagogue is but the hierarch of Mammon's altar. Does he not, for instance, pervert that other educating agency, the press, just as violently as the Jesuit the school? Now, let him become ruler in the State and the State become educator; and there is just the same risk that the education of youth will be perverted to subserve a faction, and that, by the hateful means of imbuing their minds with error and passion in place of truth and right. The result is despotism of a party instead of a pope. One may be as bad as the other.

But if the State is the educator, in America, at least, education must be secularized totally. In theory our State is *the institute for realizing secular justice*. It has absolutely severed itself from all religions equally; has pledged itself that no man's civil rights shall be modified or equality diminished by any religion or the lack of any; and has forbidden the establishment of any religion by law, and the imposition of any burden for a religious pretext on any. But the State school teacher is her



official, and teaches by her authority. All school-officials derive their authority from State laws, hence all their functions are as truly State actions as those of the sheriff in hanging, or the judge in sentencing a murderer. Especially is the school fund, raised by taxation, the common and equal property of the people.

But as our people are divided among many religions, that money ought no more to be used in schools to teach one religion in preference to the others, than in a church establishment. Once the people of a small State, like Connecticut, were so homogeneous, that any dissentient minority was minute, and the dominant religion was taught "on State account," without any protest loud enough to be inconvenient. But the mixture of our people, and especially the strength and audacity of popery, now makes all this different. Papists make an effective issue, arguing that the State must not use the people's money to teach King James's version, which they, a part of the people, believe heretical. Zealous Protestants, usually zealous State school men, try to flout this plea. But would they assent to the State's teaching their children, with their money, the version which says: "Except ye *do penance* ye shall all likewise perish?" They exclaim: "That is an erroneous version, while King James's is faithful." Theologically that is doubtless true. But the very point of the State's covenant with the people is, that *the State shall not judge, either way, of that proposition*. It has been bargained that, in the State *arena*, we shall respect papists' religious views, precisely as we require them to respect ours. Suppose them, some day, in as large a majority in some State as Protestants are in New England, would we acquiesce in their forcing the study of the *Douay version* in State schools? So, unless we admit that our might makes our right, we ought not to inflict the parallel wrongs on the Jews, Mohammedans, Atheists, and Buddhists among us, because they are still few.

It is sought to parry this conclusion thus: While all religions are equal, and no one established, the State is not an atheistic institute, but must ground itself in the will of God, which is the standard of all rights. That the State is an ethical institute and for ethical ends. That hence it enjoins the Sabbath, punishes blasphemy, etc. That equally the State, while not establishing one religion to the prejudice of others, ought

to teach the divine truths common to all, by the unsectarian use of the Bible. But, whether this be the just basis of a commonwealth or not, our *States do not avow it*. And second, the question is not of the original Scripture in common schools, but of some one version, among other competing ones, which even Protestants do not claim to be infallible. Hence the question, Which version? raises sectarian issues. Third, we do not believe, any more than these reasoners, that the State can be atheistic, because it is an ethical institute, and the divine will is the only valid ethical rule. But the State finds the theistic basis in natural theology. The proof is, that pagan States, resting only on natural theism, were valid, and rightfully (Rom. 13: 5) possessed the allegiance even of Christians. The evasion therefore is futile.

But be the logic of this question what it may, the actual result is certain. The papists will inevitably carry the point, as they have already done in many places. That they will triumph everywhere else that they care to try, is plain from the growing timidity of the Bible advocates, the poverty of the compromises they offer, and the spreading indifference of the masses to the value of biblical teaching. In fact, on American premises, the Bible advocates have no plea but a pious predilection, and sooner or later logical considerations, when so clear, must assert their force. The difficulty of the problem appears thus: That it agitates other free governments than ours, as the British and Holland, at this day.

For the solution there are, on the theory of State education, four suggestions. The first is the unjust one of forcing the religion of the majority on the minority. The second is what is called in Great Britain the plan of "concurrent endowments." Each denomination may have its own schools endowed by the State, and teach its own religion in it along with secular learning. This is virtually the plan by which New York papists have been partially appeased. It is justly rejected by Protestants everywhere. First, because it offers no solution save where the several denominations are populous enough to sustain a school for each in the same vicinage. Second, because the State has no right thus virtually to assert the co-ordinate and equal value of opposing creeds, the truth of one of which may imply the positive falsehood of another. Third, because the

State has no right to indicate of either of the creeds that it is, or is not, true and valuable. Fourth, because Protestantism is more promotive of thrift and wealth than the erroneous creeds; whence a given number of Protestants will pay more school-tax than the same number of errorists, so that this plan uses a part of their money to foster creeds they conscientiously believe mischievous. Fifth, it gives to error a pecuniary and moral support beyond what it would receive from the spontaneous zeal of its votaries. And last, it disunites the population by training youth in hostile religious camps. Irish and American papists have professed to approve because they gain by the plan. But who dreams that if they were in the majority they would be willing to see "good Catholic money" expended in teaching Protestant heresy?

The third plan proposes to give "unsectarian" religious instruction in the first hour of the day, while parents who dissent from it are allowed to detain their children from school until that hour is passed. This amounts to the State's establishing a religion and using the people's money to teach it, but *permitting dissent* without any other penalty than the taxation for a religious object which the taxpayer condemns. That is to say, it places the matter where England places her established religion, since the "Toleration Act" of William and Mary relieved dissenters of penal pains for absence from the Anglican churches. But the thing Americans claim is *liberty* and not *toleration*. They deny the State's right to select a religion, as the true and useful one, for anybody, willing or unwilling. Those who dissent from the selected religion deny that the State may thus expend the people's money as a bait to careless or erroneous parents to submit their children to the inculcation of error.

The only other alternative is to secularize the State's teaching absolutely, limiting it to matters merely secular, and leaving parents or the Church to supplement it with such religious teaching as they may please, or none. Some Christians, driven by the difficulty which has been disclosed, adopt this conclusion. The largest number, notwithstanding the difficulty, reject it with energy. Let us see whether this plan is either *possible* or *admissible*.

This is really the vital question. It cannot be discussed

until we agree what education is, and disperse deceptive misconceptions of it. It is properly the whole man or person that is educated; but the main subject of the work is the spirit. Education is the nurture and development of the whole man for his proper end. The end must be conceived aright in order to understand the process. Even man's earthly end is predominantly moral. Now, if dexterity in any art, as in the handling of printer's type, a musket, a burin, a power-loom, were education, its secularization might be both possible and proper. Is not a confusion here the source of most of the argument in defense of that theory? For instance, "Why may not the State teach reading and writing without any religious adjuncts, as legitimately as the mechanic thus teaches his apprentices filing, planing, or hammering?" Because dexterity in an art is not education. The latter nurtures a soul, the other only drills a sense-organ or muscle; the one has a mechanical end, the other a moral. And this answer cannot be met by saying, "Let it then be agreed that the State is only teaching an art, a dexterity—that, for instance, of letters." For the State refuses to be understood thus: it claims *to educate*; as is witnessed by the universal argument of the advocates of this State function, that she has the right and duty of providing that the young citizens shall be competent to their responsibility as citizens. But these are ethical. Again, if the State professed to bestow, not an education, but a dexterity, equity would require her bestowing not only the arts of letters, but all other useful arts. For only the minority can ever live by literary arts; the great majority of children have equal rights to be taught the other bread-winning arts. Thus government would become the wildest communism. No, the State cannot adopt this evasion; unless she says that she *educates*, she can say nothing.

It should also be remarked here that the arts of reading and writing are rather means of education than education itself, and not the only nor the most effective means. As Macaulay showed, against Dr. S. Johnson, the unlettered part of the Athenians were, in some respects, highly educated, while we see many minds, with these arts, really undeveloped.

But is a really secularized education either possible or admissible?

First, No people of any age, religion, or civilization, before

ours, has ever thought so. Against the present attempt, right or wrong, stands the whole common sense of mankind. Pagan, Papist, Mohammedan, Greek, Protestant, have all hitherto rejected any other education than one grounded in religion, as absurd and wicked. Let Mr. Webster be heard against the Girard will, which enjoined, in order to exclude Christianity from his college, that no minister should ever enter its walls. The argument against the will here was, that the trust it proposed to create was, in this, so opposed to all civilized jurisprudence, as to make it outside the law, and so void. So formidable did the point seem to lawyers, that Mr. Horace Binney, of the defense, went to England to ransack the British laws of trusts. It was in urging this point that Mr. Webster uttered the memorable words:

"In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere. Never! Everywhere, and at all times, it has been regarded as essential. *It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction.*" And this was not the assertion of Mr. Webster, the politician, but of the learned lawyer, face to face with able opponents, and making one of the most responsible forensic efforts of his life. He knew that he was uttering the weighty voice of history and jurisprudence.

Let another witness be heard, of equal learning and superior character.\* "It must be acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable phenomena of our perverted humanity, that among a Christian people, and in a Protestant land, such a discussion" (whether the education of youth may not be secularized) "should not seem as absurd as to inquire whether school-rooms should be located under water or in darksome caverns! The Jew, the Mohammedan, the follower of Confucius, and of Brahma, each and all are careful to instruct the youth of their people in the tenets of the religions they profess, and are not content until, by direct and reiterated teaching, they have been made acquainted with at least the outline of the books which contain, as they believe, the revealed will of Deity. Whence comes it that Christians are so indifferent to a duty so obvious, and so obviously recognized by Jew and Pagan?"

We are attempting then an absolute novelty. But may not

---

\*John B. Minor, LL. D., University of Virginia.

the tree be already known by its fruits? State education among Americans tends to be entirely secularized. What is the result? Whence this general revolt from the Christian faith in this country, so full of churches, preachers, and a redundant Christian literature, so boastful of its Sabbaths and its evangelism? What has prepared so many for the dreary absurdities of materialism? Why do the journals which seek a national circulation think it their interest to affect irreligion? Why so many lamentations over public and popular corruptions? He who notes the current of opinion sees that the wisest are full of misgivings as to the fruits of present methods. As a specimen, let these words, from the Governor of Massachusetts, at a recent anniversary, be taken: "He" (Gov. Rice) "lifted up a warning voice, with respect to the inadequacy and perils of our modern system of one-sided education, which supposed it could develop manhood and good citizenship out of mere brain culture."

Second, True education is, in a sense, a spiritual process, the nurture of a soul. By spiritual, the divines mean the acts and states produced by the Holy Ghost, as distinguished from the merely ethical. The nurture of these is not human education, but sanctification. Yet education is the nurture of a spirit which is rational and moral, in which conscience is the regulative and imperative faculty; whose proper end, even in this world, is moral. But God is the only Lord of the conscience; this soul is his miniature likeness; his will is the source of obligation to it; likeness to him is its perfection, and religion is the science of the soul's relations to God. Let these statements be placed together, and the theological and educational processes appear so cognate that they cannot be separated. Hence it is that the common sense of mankind has ever invoked the guidance of the minister of religion for the education of youth; in India the Brahmin, in Turkey the Imam, in Jewry the Rabbi, and in Christian lands the pastor. So, everywhere, the sacred books have always been the prime text-books. The only exception in the world is that which Rome has made for herself by her intolerable abuse of her powers. Does the secularist answer that this sacerdotal education results in a Boeotian character and puerile culture? Yes, where the sacred books are false Scriptures, but not where it is the Bible which is the text-book. So that these instances prove that the common sense of

mankind has been at bottom correct, and has only been abused, in some instances, by imposture.

The soul is a spiritual monad, an indivisible, spiritual unit, without parts, as without extension. Those powers, which we name as separate faculties, are only modes of function with which this unit is qualified, differentiated by the distinctions of the objects on which they operate. The central power is still one. From these truths it would appear that it cannot be successfully cultivated by patches. We cannot have the intellectual workman polish it at one place, and the spiritual at another. A succession of objects may be presented to the soul, to evoke and discipline its several powers; yet the unity of the being would seem to necessitate a unity in its successful culture.

It is the Christian ideas which are most stimulating and ennobling to the soul. He who must needs omit them from his teaching is robbed of the right arm of his strength. Where shall he get such a definition of virtue as is presented in the revealed character of God? Where so ennobling a picture of benevolence as that presented in Christ's sacrifice for his enemies? Can the conception of the inter-stellar spaces so expand the mind as the thought of an infinite God, an eternal existence, and an everlasting destiny?

Every line of true knowledge must find its completeness in its convergency to God, even as every beam of daylight leads the eye to the sun. If religion be excluded from our study, every process of thought will be arrested before it reaches its proper goal. The structure of thought must remain a truncated cone, with its proper apex lacking. Richard Baxter has nervously expressed this truth.\*

Third, If secular education is to be made consistently and honestly non-Christian, then all its more important branches must be omitted, or they must submit to a mutilation and falsification, far worse than absolute omission. It is hard to conceive how a teacher is to keep his covenant faithfully with the State so to teach history, cosmogony, psychology, ethics, the laws of nations, as to insinuate nothing favorable or unfavorable touching the preferred beliefs of either the evangelical Christians, Papists, Socinians, Deists, Pantheists, Materialists, or Fetisch worshippers, who claim equal rights under American

---

\*"Reformed Pastor" pp. 94, 96.

institutions. His paedagogics must indeed be "the play of Hamlet, with the part of Hamlet omitted." Shall the secular education leave the young citizen totally ignorant of his own ancestry? But how shall he learn the story of those struggles, through which Englishmen achieved those liberties which the colonies inherited, without understanding the fiery persecutions of the Protestants under "Bloody Mary," over which the Pope's own Legate, Cardinal Pole, was sent to preside? How shall the sons of Huguenot sires in New York, Virginia, or Carolina know for what their fathers forsook beautiful France, to hide themselves in the Northern snows or the malarious woods of the South, and read nothing of the violation of the "Edict of Nantes," the "Dragonnades," and the wholesale assassination of St. Bartholomew's day, in honor of which an "infallible" predecessor of the Pope sang *Te Deums* and struck medals? Or, if the physicist attempt to ascend farther in man's history, can he give the genesis of earth and man, without intimating whether Moses or Huxley is his prophet? Or can the science of moral obligation be established in impartial oversight of God's relation to it, and of the question whether or not his will defines and grounds all human duty? Or can a Grotius or a Vattel settle the rights of nature and nations without either affirming along with the Apostles that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation," or else denying it with the infidel ethnologist? How much of the noblest literature must be ostracized, if this plan is to be honestly carried out? The State teacher must not mention to his pupil Shakespeare, nor Bacon, nor Milton, nor Macaulay. The *E xpurgatorius* of free democracy will be far more stringent than that of despotic Rome! But it is not necessary to multiply these instances. They show that Christian truths and facts are so woven into the very warp and woof of the knowledge of Americans, and constitute so beneficial and essential a part of our civilization, that the secular teacher, who impartially avoids either the affirmation or denial of them, must reduce his teaching to the bare giving of those scanty rudiments, which are, as we have seen, not knowledge, but the mere signs of knowledge.

Does some one say that practically this showing is exagger-



ated, for he is teaching some purely secular course, without any such maiming of his subjects or prejudicing of Christianity? If his teaching is more than a temporary dealing with some corner of education, the fact will be found to be that it is tacitly anti-Christian; overt assaults are not made; but there is a studied avoidance which is in effect hostile. There can be no neutral position between two extremes, where there is no middle ground, but "a great gulf fixed."

Fourth, Of all rightful human action the will is the executive and the conscience the directive faculty. Unless these be purified and enlightened, to enhance the vigor of the soul's other actions by training is but superfluous mischief. If in a ship the compass be lost and the pilot blind, it is better that there should not be a great force to move her machinery. The more energetic its motion, the greater is the likelihood the ship will speedily be upon the breakers. Surely this is sufficient to show to the reflecting mind that right moral inculcation cannot be separated at any point or for any time from the intellectual, without mischief.

One very obvious and yet not the weightiest application of this truth is to the discipline of the school itself. No training of any faculty takes place without some government. On what moral basis shall the teacher who wholly suppresses all appeal to religion rest that authority which he must exercise in the school-room? He will find it necessary to say to the pupil, "Be diligent. Be obedient. Lie not. Defraud not," in order that he may learn his secular knowledge. But on whose authority? There is but one ground of moral obligation, the will of God, and among the people of this country he who does not find the disclosure of that will in the Scriptures, most often finds it nowhere. But this teacher must not inculcate this Bible. Then his mere might must make his right, or else the might of the parent, or of the magistrate, to whose delegated authority he points back. Or his appeal may be to mere self-interest!

Will this government be wholesome for a youth's soul?

But from a pupil the youth becomes a citizen. He passes under wider and more complex obligations. The end of the State schooling is to fit him for this. The same question recurs, with transcendent moment, On what basis of right shall

these duties rest? As a man, it is presumable he will act as he was taught while a boy. Of course then the grounds of obligation employed with him in school should be the ones he is to recognize in adult life. In the State school a non-Christian standard alone could be given him. He cannot be expected now to rise to any better; he may sink to a lower, seeing the ground then given him had no foundation under it.

That is to say, young Americans are to assume their responsibilities with pagan morals, for these are just what human reason attains from the non-Christian standard. Will this suffice to sustain American institutions? One may say: Natural theism may deduce quite a high ethical code, as witness the Greek philosophy. So could a man who rightly construed the *data* of his consciousness be an atheist; even the atheist might find in them proof that conscience ought to govern. But he does not, nor does the pagan reason *act* as Epictetus *speculated*. Let us begin to legislate for the people *as they ought to be*, and we shall have a fine card-castle. In fact, Americans, taken as we find them, who do not get their moral restraints from the Bible, have none. If, in our moral training of the young, we let go the "Thus saith the Lord," we shall have no hold left. The training which does not base duty on Christianity is, for us, practically immoral. If testimony to this truth is needed, let the venerable Dr. Griffin, of a former generation, be heard. "To educate the mind of a bad man without correcting his morals is to put a sword into the hands of a maniac." Let John Locke be heard. "It is virtue, then, direct virtue, which is the hard and valuable part to be aimed at in education." \* \* \* \* \* "If virtue and a well-tempered soul be not got and settled so as to keep out ill and vicious habits, languages and science, and all the other accomplishments of education, will be to no purpose but to make the worse or more dangerous man." Let Dr. Francis Wayland be heard. "Intellectual cultivation may easily exist without the existence of virtue or love of right. In this case its only effect is to stimulate desire; and this, unrestrained by the love of right, must eventually overturn the social fabric which it at first erected." Last, let Washington be heard, in his farewell address, where he teaches that the virtue of the citizens is the only basis for

social safety, and that the Christian religion is the only adequate basis for that virtue.

But, is not mental culture *per se* elevating? It is hard for us to give up this flattery, because hitherto education has been more or less Christian. The minister has been the American school-master. But are not the educated the more elevated? Yes. For the reason just given, and for another; not that their mental culture made them seek higher morals, but their (and their parents') higher morals made them seek mental culture! We are prone to put the cart before the horse. Again I cite evidence. James Anthony Froude, a witness by no means friendly to orthodoxy, quoting Miss Florence Nightingale, emphatically endorses her opinion, that the ordinary, as the natural effect of the mere communication of secular knowledge to youths, is only to suggest the desire for more numerous, and, for the bulk of men whose destiny is inevitably narrow, illicit objects of desire. But they plead: In teaching the youth to know of more objects of desire you also teach him to know more restraining considerations. The fatal answer is that knowledge does not rule the heart, but conscience (if anything does); mere knowledge, without God's fear, makes desire grow faster than discretion. Says Sir Henry Bulwer: "I do not place much confidence in the philosopher who pretends that the knowledge which develops the passions is an instrument for their suppression, or that where there are the most desires there is likely to be the most order, and the most abstinence in their gratification." Again, the soul should grow symmetrically. Let the boughs of a tree grow, while the roots (without actual disease) stand still; the first gale would blow it over, because of the disproportion of its parts.

Fifth, We need the best men to teach our children. The best are true Christians, who carry their religion into everything. Such men neither can nor will bind themselves to hold so influential a relation to precious souls for whom Christ died, and make no effort to save them. So the tendency must be towards throwing State schools into the hands of half-hearted Christians or of contemptuous unbelievers. Can such be even trusted with an important secular task? Railroads persist in breaking the Sabbath; so they must be served on the track exclusively by profane Sabbath-breakers or truckling professors

of religion. The consequence is, they are scourged with negligent officials, drunken engineers, and defaulting cashiers. So the State will fall into the hands of teachers who will not even teach secular learning honestly; money will be wasted, and the schools will become corrupting examples to their own pupils of slighted work and abused trusts.

Sixth, To every Christian citizen, the most conclusive argument against a secularized education is contained in his own creed touching human responsibility. According to this, obligation to God covers all of every man's being and actions. Even if the act be correct in outward form, which is done without any reference to his will, he will judge it a shortcoming. "The ploughing of the wicked is sin." The intentional end to which our action is directed determines its moral complexion supremely. Second, Our Savior has declared that there is no moral neutrality: "He that is not with him is against him, and he that gathereth not with him scattereth abroad." Add now the third fact, that every man is born in a state of alienation from God; that practical enmity and atheism are the natural outgrowth of this disposition; that the only remedy for this natural disease of man's spirit is gospel truth. The comparison of these truths will make it perfectly plain that *a non-Christian training is literally an anti Christian training.*

This is the conclusive argument. The rejoinder is at tempted; that Christians hold this theology as church members, and not as citizens; and that we have ourselves urged that the State is not an evangelical agent, and its proper business is not to convert souls from original sin. True, but neither has it a right to become an anti-evangelical agency, and resist the work of the spiritual commonwealth. While the State does not authorize the theological beliefs of the Christian citizens, neither has it a right to war against them. While we have no right to ask the State to propagate our theology, we have a right to demand that it shall not oppose it. But to educate souls thus is to oppose it, because a non-Christian training is an anti-Christian training. It may be urged again, that this result, if evil, will not be lessened by the State's ceasing to teach at all, for then the training of youth will be, so far as she is concerned, equally non-Christian. The answer is, that it is one thing to tolerate a wrong as done by a party over whom we have not law-

ful control, but wholly another to perpetrate that wrong ourselves. For the State thus to do what she ought to condemn in the godless parent, though she be not authorized to interfere would be the sin of "*framing mischief by a law*," the very trait of that "throne of iniquity" with which the Lord cannot have fellowship.

It is objected again, that if the State may govern and punish, which are moral functions, she may also teach. If we are prepared for the theocratic idea of the State, which makes it the universal human association, *To Hav* of human organisms, bound to do everything for society from mending a road or draining a marsh up to supporting a religion, then we can conclude thus. But then consistency will add to State schools a State religion, a beneficed clergy, a religious test for office, and State power wielded to suppress theological as well as social error. Again, while secular ruling and punishing are ethical functions, they are sufficiently grounded in the light of natural theism. But teaching is a spiritual function—in the sense defined—and for teaching beings fallen, and in moral ruin, natural theism is wholly inadequate, as witness the state of pagan society. Christian citizens are entitled (not by the State, but by one higher, God) to hold that the only teaching adequate for this fallen soul is *redemption*. But of this the State, as such, knows nothing. As God's institute for realizing secular justice, she does know enough of moral right to be a praise to them that do well and a terror to evil-doers.

The most plausible evasion is this: Since education is so comprehensive a work, why may there not be a "division of labor?" Let the State train the intellect and the Christian parent and the Church train the conscience and heart in the home and the house of worship. With this solution some Christians profess themselves satisfied. Of course such an arrangement would not be so bad as the neglect of the heart by both State and parent.

Points already made contain fatal answers. Since conscience is the regulative faculty of all, he who must not deal with conscience cannot deal well with any. Since the soul is a *monad*, it cannot be equipped as to different parts at different times and places, as a man might get his hat at one shop and his boots at another; it has no parts. Since all truths converge

towards God, he who is not to name God, must have all his teachings fragmentary; he can only construct a truncated figure. In history, ethics, philosophy, jurisprudence, religious facts and propositions are absolutely inseparable. The necessary discipline of a school-room and secular fidelity of teachers call for religion, or we miss of them. And no person nor organism has a right to seem to say to a responsible, immortal soul, "In this large and intelligent and even ethical segment of your doings you are entitled to be godless." For this teaching State must not venture to disclaim that construction of its own proceeding to its own pupil. *That disclaimer would be a religious inculcation!*

But farther: Why do people wish the State to interfere in educating? Because she has the power, the revenues to do it better. Then, unless her intervention is to be a cheat, her secularized teaching must be some very impressive thing. Then its impression, which is to be non-Christian, according to the theory, will be too preponderant in the youth's soul, to be counterpoised by the feebler inculcation of the seventh day. The natural heart is carnal, and leans to the secular and away from the gospel truths. To the ingenuous youth, quickened by animating studies, his teacher is *Magnus Apollo*, and according to this plan he must be to his ardent young votary wholly a heathen deity. The Christian side of the luminary, if there is one, must not be revealed to the worshipper! Then how pale and cold will the infrequent ray of gospel truth appear when it falls on him upon the seventh day! In a word, to the successful pupil under an efficient teacher, *the school is his world*. Make that godless, and his life is made godless.

If it be asked again: Why may not the State save itself trouble by leaving all education to parents? The answer is, Because so many parents are too incapable or careless to be trusted with the task. Evidently, if most parents did the work well enough, the State would have no motive to meddle. Then the very *raison d'être* of the State school is in this large class of negligent parents. But man is a carnal being, alienated from godliness, whence all those who neglect their children's mental, will, *a fortiori*, neglect their spiritual, culture. Hence we must expect that, *as to the very class* which constitutes the pretext for the State's interposition, *the fatally one-sided culture she give*

*will remain one-sided.* She has no right to presume anything else. But, it may be asked: Is not there the church to take up this part, neglected by both secularized State and godless parent? The answer is; The State, thus secularized, cannot claim to know the Church as an ally. Besides, if the Church be found sufficiently omnipresent, willing, and efficient, through the commonwealth, to be thus relied on, why will she not inspire in parents and individual philanthropists zeal enough to care for the whole education of youth? Thus again, the whole *raison d'être* for the State's intervention would be gone. In fact the Church does not and cannot repair the mischief which her more powerful, rich, and ubiquitous rival, the secularized State, is doing in thus giving, under the guise of a non-Christian, an anti-Christian training.

It is also well known to practical men that State common schools *obstruct* parental and philanthropic effort. Thus, parents who, if not meddled with, would follow the impulse of enlightened Christian neighbors, their natural guides, in creating a private school for their children, to make it both primary and classical, now always stop at the primary. "The school tax must be paid anyhow, which is heavy, and that is all they can do." Next, children of poor parents who showed aspiration for learning found their opportunity for classical tuition near their homes, in the innumerable private schools created by parental interest and public spirit, and kindly neighborhood charity never suffered such deserving youths to be arrested for the mere lack of tuition. Now, in country places not populous enough to sustain "State High Schools," all such youths must stop at the rudiments. Thus the country loses a multitude of the most useful educated men. Next, the best men being the natural leaders of their neighbors, would draw a large part of the children of the class next them upward into the private schools created for their own families, which, for the same reason, were sure to be Christian schools. The result is, that while a larger number of children is brought into primary schools, and while the statistics of the illiterate are somewhat changed, to the great delectation of shallow philanthropists, the number of youths well educated in branches above mere rudiments, and especially of those brought under daily Christian training, is diminished. In cities (where public opinion is chiefly manufactured)

high schools may be sustained, and this evil obviated so far as secular tuition goes. But in the vast country regions, literary culture is lowered just as it is extended. It is chiefly the country which fills the useful professions—town youths go into *trade*.

The actual and consistent secularization of education is inadmissible.

But nearly all public men and divines declare that the State schools are the glory of America, that they are a finality, and in no event to be surrendered. And we have seen that their complete secularization is logically inevitable. Christians must prepare themselves then, for the following results: All prayers, catechisms, and Bibles will ultimately be driven out of the schools. But this will not satisfy Papists, who obstinately—and correctly were their religion correct—insist that education shall be Christian for their children. This power over the hopes and fears of the demagogues will secure, what Protestants cannot consistently ask for, a separate endowment out of the common funds. Rome will enjoy, relatively to Protestantism, a grand advantage in the race of propagandism; for humanity always finds out, sooner or later, that it cannot get on without a religion, and it will take a false one in preference to none. Infidelity and practical ungodliness will become increasingly prevalent among Protestant youth, and our churches will have a more arduous contest for growth if not for existence.

Perhaps American Protestants might be led, not to abandon but to revise their opinions touching education, by recalling the conditions under which the theory of State education came to be first accepted in this country. This came about in the colonies which at the same time held firmly to a union of Church and State. The Massachusetts and Connecticut colonies, for instance, honorable pioneers in State education in this country, were decidedly theoretic in their constitution. The Reformed religion was intimately interwoven. So all the Protestant States of Europe, whose successful example is cited, as Scotland and Prussia, have the Protestant as an established religion. This and State primary education have always been parts of one consistent system in the minds of their rulers in Church and State. A secularized education, such as that which is rapidly becoming the result of our State school system, would have been indig-



nantly reprobated by the Winthrops and Mathers, the Knoxs, Melvilles, and Chalmers, and, it is presumed, by the Tholucks and even Bismarcks of those commonwealths, which are pointed to as precedents and models. It is submitted, whether it is exactly candid to quote the opinions and acts of all these great men, for what is, in fact, another thing from what they advocated? Knox, for instance, urged the primary education of every child in Scotland by the State. But it was because the State he had helped to reconstruct there was clothed with a recognized power of teaching the Reformed religion (through the allied Church), and because it was therefore able, in teaching the child to read, also to teach it the Scriptures and the Assembly's Catechism. Had Knox seen himself compelled to a severance of Church and State (which he would have denounced as wicked and paganish), and therefore to the giving by the State of a secularized education, which trained the intellect without the conscience or heart, his heroic tongue would have given no uncertain sound. Seeing then that wise and good men in adopting and successfully working this system, did so only for communities which united Church and State, and mental and spiritual training, the question for candid consideration is: What modifications the theory should receive, when it is imported into commonwealths whose civil governments have absolutely secularized themselves and made the union of the secular and spiritual powers illegal and impossible?

The answer may, perhaps, be found by going back to a first principle hinted in the outset of this discussion. Is the direction of the education of children either a civic or an ecclesiastical function? Is it not properly a domestic and parental function? First, we read in holy writ that God ordained the family by the union of one woman to one man, in one flesh, for life, for the declared end of "seeking a godly seed." Does not this imply that he looks to parents, in whom the family is founded, as the responsible agents of this result? He has also in the fifth Commandment connected the child proximately, not with either presbyter or magistrate, but with the parents, which, of course, confers on them the adequate and the prior authority. This argument appears again in the very order of the historical genesis of the family and State, as well as of the visible Church. The family was first. Parents at the outset were the only social

heads existing. The right rearing of children by them was in order to the right creation of the other two institutes. It thus appears that naturally the parents' authority over their children could not have come by deputation from either State or visible Church, any more than the water in a fountain by derivation from its reservoir below. Second, the dispensation of Divine Providence in the course of nature shows where the power and duty of educating are deposited. That ordering is that *the parents* decide in what *status* the child shall begin his adult career. The son inherits the fortune, the social position, the responsibility, or the ill-fame of his father. Third, God has provided for the parents social and moral influences so unique, so extensive, that no other earthly power, or all others together, can substitute them in fashioning the child's character. The home example, armed with the venerable authority of the father and the mother, repeated amidst the constant intimacies of the fireside, seconded by filial reverence, ought to have the most potent plastic force over character. And this unique power God has guarded by an affection, the strongest, most deathless, and most unselfish, which remains in the breast of fallen man. Until the magistrate can feel a love, and be nerved by it to a self-denying care and toil, equal to that of a father and a mother, he can show no pretext for assuming any parental function.

But the best argument here is the heart's own instinct. No parent can fail to resent, with a righteous indignation, the intrusion of any authority between his conscience and convictions and the soul of his child. If the father conscientiously believes that his own creed is true and righteous and obligatory before God, then he must intuitively regard the intrusion of any other power between him and his minor child, to cause the rejection of that creed, as a usurpation. The freedom of mind of the child alone, when become an adult, and his father's equal, can justly interpose. If this usurpation is made by the visible church, it is felt to be in the direction of popery, if by the magistrate, in the direction of depotism.

It may be said that this theory makes the parent sovereign, during the child's mental and moral minority, in the moulding of his opinions and character, whereas, seeing the parent is fallible, and may form his child amiss, there ought to be a superior authority to superintend and intervene. But the com-

plete answer is, that inasmuch as the supreme authority *must be placed somewhere*, God has indicated that, on the whole, no place is so safe for it as the hands of the parent, who has the supreme love for the child and the superior opportunity. But many parents nevertheless neglect or pervert the power? Yes, and does the State never neglect and pervert its powers? With the lessons of history to teach us the horrible and almost universal abuses of power in the hands of civil rulers, that question is conclusive. In the case of an unjust or godless State, the evil would be universal and sweeping. Doubtless God has deposited the duty in the safest place.

The competitions of the State and the Church for the educating power have been so engrossing that we have almost forgotten the parent, as the third and the rightful competitor. And now many look at his claim almost contemptuously. Because the civic and the ecclesiastical spheres are so much wider and more populous than his, they are prone to regard it as every way inferior. Have we not seen that the smaller circle is, in fact, the most original and best authorized of the three? Will any thinking man admit that he *derives his right to marry*, to be a father, from the permission of the State? Yet there is an illusion here, because civic constitutions confer on the State certain police functions, so to speak, concerning marriage and families. So there are State laws concerning certain ecclesiastical belongings. But what Protestant concedes therefrom that his religious rights were either conferred, or can be rightfully taken away, by civil authority? The truth is, that God has immediately and authoritatively instituted three organisms for man on earth, the State, the visible Church, and the Family, and these are co-ordinate in rights and mutual independence. The State or Church has no more right to invade the parental sphere than the parent to invade theirs. The right distribution of all duties and power between the three circles would be the complete solution of that problem of good government which has never yet been solved with full success. It is vital to a true theory of human rights, that the real independence of the smallest yet highest realm, that of the parent, be respected. Has it not been proved that the direction of education is one of its prerogatives?

But does not the State's right to exist imply the right to secure all the conditions of its existence? And as parents may

so pervert or neglect education as to rear a generation incompetent to preserve their civil institutions, does not this give the State control over education? I answer, first, it is not even a pretext for the State's invading the parental sphere any farther than the destructive neglect exists, that is, to stimulate, or help, or compel the neglectful parents alone. Second, precisely the same argument may authorize the State to intrude into the spiritual circle and establish and teach a religion. But the sophism is here: It is assumed that a particular form of civil institutions has a prescriptive right to perpetuate itself. It has none. So the American theory teaches, in asserting for the people the inherent right to change their institutions. Did our republican fathers hold that any people have ever the right to subvert the moral order of society ordained by God and nature? Surely not. Here then is disclosed that distinction between the *moral order* and any particular *civil order*, so often overlooked, but so eloquently drawn by *Cousin*. So far is it from being true that the civil authority is entitled to shape a people to suit itself; the opposite is true, the people should shape the civil authority.

It is a maxim in political philosophy, as in mechanics, that when an organism is applied to a function for which it was not designed, it is injured and the function is ill done. Here is a farmer who has a mill designed and well fitted to grind his meal. He resolves that it shall also thresh his sheaves. The consequence is that he has wretched threshing and a crippled mill. I repeat, God designed the State to be the organ for securing secular justice. When it turns to teaching or preaching it repeats the farmers' experience. The Chinese Government and people are an example in point. The Government has been for a thousand years educating the people for its own ends. The result is what we see.

Government powerfully affects national character by the mode in which it performs its proper functions, and if the administration is equitable, pure and free, it exalts the people. But it is by the indirect influence. This is all it can do well. As for the other part of the national elevation (an object which every good man must desire), it must come from other agencies; from the dispensation of Almighty Providence; from fruitful ideas and heroic acts with which he inspires the great men

whom he sovereignly gives to the nations he designs to bless; chiefly from the energy of divine Truth and the Christian virtues, first in individuals, next in families, and last in visible churches.

Let us suppose, then, that both State and Church recognize the parent as the educating power; that they assume towards him an ancillary instead of a dominating attitude; that the State shall encourage individual and voluntary efforts by holding the impartial shield of legal protection over all property which may be devoted to education; that it shall encourage all private efforts; and that in its eleemosynary character it shall aid those whose poverty and misfortunes disable them from properly rearing their own children. Thus the insoluble problems touching religion in State schools would be solved, because the State was not the responsible creator of the schools, but the parents. Our educational system might present less mechanical symmetry, but it would be more flexible, more practical, and more useful.

ROBERT L. DABNEY.

## WILSON'S SLAVE POWER IN AMERICA.<sup>1</sup>

---

*History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America. By Henry Wilson. Boston: James R. Osgood & Company, 3 Vols., 8vo., pp. 670, 720, and 774.*

This ponderous work is what the well-informed reader would expect from its author. The first volume professes to treat the rise of slavery in the United States, from its beginnings up to the admission of Texas. The second continues the history of the sectional controversies about it, to the election of Lincoln. The third treats of the war and its results.

Of this huge "partisan document," it may be justly said, that its staple material is sophistry and misrepresentation, and its very title an insult and falsehood. In the sense of the author, there has been no "slave power" in America. It suited the purposes of the conspirators among whom Mr. Wilson acted all his political life, to advance their project of riding into sectional domination by means of the Abolition phrensy, to imagine a "slave power" in the South, which cherished the counterpart design to his: that of usurping the authority of the United States to extend slavery, at the expense of others' rights, over the whole country. But in fact, the States whose citizens owned slaves, never were a "slave power" in any sense but this: that they endeavored to employ the rights guaranteed to them by the laws to protect their legal property; just as Ohio sought to protect the property of her citizens in their swine; Kentucky hers in their mules; and just as Mr. Wilson sought to protect his property in shoes. The only differences were that the South never imitated his protection of his shoe-making profits by partial and dishonest tariffs; and that those interested in the swine, the mules, and the shoes, were not compelled to a constant self-defense, because they did not experience from us the constant and lawless assaults on their rights, which Mr. Wilson's set aimed at our industries and lawful interests.

---

<sup>1</sup>—Appeared in *Southern Planter and Farmer*, July, 1857.

The book, whose very title is false, may be safely expected to furnish abundance of similar material in its pages. The reader has to go a very short distance, indeed, to find this expectation verified. The preface, in its first paragraphs, informs us that in 1860, 1861, "treasonable menaces had ripened into treasonable deeds. A rebellion of gigantic proportions burst upon the nation with suddenness and fierceness." \* \* \*

"These crimes against the peace, the unity, and the life of the nation, and these sacrifices of property, of health, and of life, were the inflictions of the slave-power, in its maddened efforts to make perpetual its hateful dominion." These six lines contain just seven manifest misstatements. There was no "nation"; for the United States were then a confederation of sovereign States, and consequently there was no "national life," in Mr. Wilson's sense. Secondly, it was hence impossible that one of these sovereign constituents could commit "treason" against its own creature, the common agent. Hence, thirdly, there could be no rebellion in the case. Fourthly, the resistance of the Southern States against usurpation was not sudden; it had been uniformly and long foretold, and was the deliberate and fore-declared result of the vital aggressions aimed at their existence. Neither, fifthly, was there any "fierceness" about it, in Mr. Wilson's sense. The South prosecuted its defensive war with a humanity and moderation chivalrous, and, in the light of subsequent events, even Quixotic. Mr. Wilson's imagination had evidently not recovered, when he penned this preface in 1872, from the impression of "fierceness" derived from his own panic at Bull Run, when he fled so fast from the "rebels" he had come to see conquered. Sixthly, none of the miseries of this war were inflicted by the States of the South, whom Mr. Wilson chooses to stigmatize as the "slave power"; for they desired only to be let alone in possession of their constitutional rights. The war was caused deliberately by Mr. Wilson and his party, who, as none know better than he knew, with calculated malice invaded our rights, goaded us to resistance, and refused all compromise, in order to avail themselves of the Abolition phrensy to revolutionize the government, establish their own faction in power, and gratify their spite against the men whom they could never forgive for being injured by them. The South made the war only in the sense in which the lamb of the fable

muddled the stream by drinking below the wolf. Seventhly, and last, the Southern States never had any "dominion," hateful or otherwise, to perpetuate, and never sought any. They never aimed to be anything but what the laws entitled them to be, coequal parties to an equitable confederation. The only "dominion" they ever had was this: that their statesmen had so commended themselves by their ability, patriotism, purity, and disinterestedness to the confederacy, that the majority of the Northern as well as the Southern citizens had preferred them to demagogues of the Wilson type. *Hinc illae lachrymae!* The true solution of these three ponderous tomes is, that they are the howl of his malice at the American people's preference for Southern gentlemen over such as him, and of his gratified revenge for the slight.

He begins his "history" (!) Vol. 1., Chap. 1., by ascribing the existence of slavery to men's selfish desire to live at other people's expense. This solution suits the slavery of his own State very well; for they, having no aliens nor savages among them by providential dispensation, went all the way to Africa to steal them for slaves. But the account which the Bible gives of the origin of slavery (Gen. ix. 25-27), is, that it came as the remedy for the depravity of the enslaved; and that it was the righteous means ordained by God to protect civilized society against the vice, laziness, theft, and violence of degraded persons, whose wickedness and ignorance rendered them unsafe depositories for the franchises of citizenship. Mr. Wilson is an ardent specimen of that species of "Christian" whose Bible is no rule when it crosses his spite or his crotchet. The Bible account of the matter is one expressly appropriate to the South; for we, when we became free commonwealths in 1776, retained slavery as the necessary and just remedy for the presence of the savage Africans, with whom the "Christians" of New England and Old England, those simon-pure Abolitionists, had deluged us against our protest.

The author then proceeds: "American slavery \* \* \* converted a being endowed with conscience, reason, affections, sympathies, and hopes, into a chattel. It sunk a free moral agent, with rational attributes and immortal aspirations, to merchandise. It made him a beast of burden in the field of toil, an outcast in social life, a cipher in the courts of law, and a



pariah in the house of God. His master could dispose of his person at will," etc., etc.

Here, again, the errors are at least as numerous as the propositions. American slavery did not make the moral personality of the bondsman "a chattel," but *established property in his labor*; precisely the thing which Mr. Wilson possessed in his shoe factory operatives, in a much more selfish and grinding form than our system. We did not make the African a "beast of burden in the field," but a laborer, more humanely treated than Mr. Wilson's hirelings. We did not make him an "outcast in social life"; he possessed among his equals abundant social ties and enjoyments, and was, moreover, connected by real and tender domestic sympathies with his master's family; a thing which Mr. Wilson never dreamed of extending to the families of his hirelings. The bondsman was not "a cipher in the courts of law." His life, person, and chastity were shielded by the same law which protected his master; and his rights had such full recognition here, that he could sue his own master, with every advantage in the litigation, for his own liberty, if he could show any suspicion of unjust detention in bondage. He was not "a pariah in the house of God." He worshipped and partook of the Lord's Supper in the same sanctuary with his master; and with at least as little social distinction as existed between Mr. Wilson and the white hireling who had been, perhaps, his late comrade on the shoe-bench. The master could not "dispose of his bondsman's person at will." The law among us secured his personal safety, life, chastity, Sabbath-rest, and subsistence, against his own master. Now, to appreciate the wickedness of this train of atrocious libels, one must remember that this man, if he ever took pains to inquire into the real nature of what he was denouncing, must have met with refutations of them all at his first step, and that, unless he literally stopped his ears, he must have often heard them disclaimed and refuted in the Senate of the United States by Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Chestnut.

The reader will be curious to know what the author does with the slave-holding and slave-trading record of his own State, both of which were of the blackest and most diabolical sort. To assume that an American Senator of Mr. Wilson's type knew something of the authentic history of his own country, might be

a very violent surmise. But it would appear that this man knew he was deceiving; because he refers expressly, Vol. I., p. 6, to Moore's "Slavery in Massachusetts," a book which tells the plain story. He glozes about the protest of one or two old gentlemen, in the early days of the colony, and some abortive and deceitful legislation against the slave trade. He quotes quite at large the protests of the Quakers (whom Massachusetts was then persecuting!) He informs us that little Rhode Island was actively engaged in the slave trade, and that Newport was a great *emporium* for this nefarious traffic. But he takes care not to tell us that in 1637, when the Plymouth colony was but seventeen years old, it made trial of its infant strength by sending out the slave ship "Desire;" that the most fiendish laws were deliberately passed and habitually enforced, for kidnapping, enslaving, and deporting the Indians near them, from whose hospitality they had secured their homes; that the "General Court" of Massachusetts recognized the trade as legal, and took a share in its profits, in the shape of an impost; and that the United States census of 1790 found six thousand slaves in this little and barren territory. These facts are all substantiated by Moore, Winthrop's Journal, and other well-known authors.

But we pass to more recent facts. Mr. Wilson, Vol. II, Chap. XLV., of course lauds the vulgar old murderer, John Brown, as one of the purest, noblest, and most disinterested of heroes and Christian martyrs. He has no objection to the crimes of the old cut-throat, save that they pursued the wrong method for assailing slavery, and prejudiced the character of the party to which they belonged. The Senator does not claim any credit for Brown's exploits; but he does not seem to care at all to veil the fact that he was cognisant of his plans, and took no effectual steps to prevent their execution. That is to say, this sworn Senator of the United States sat silent while he knew that treason against not only the State of Virginia, but the United States, was brewing; and he did nothing to arrest the crime, save dissuade from it on grounds of party policy. It was well for his neck that the laws of the United States did not retain the doctrine of constructive treason, and that the Constitution and Government were so soon destroyed; else the historian might have shared the fate of his hero.

As a specimen of his historical accuracy, we may note, Vol.

III., Chap. XII., where he assures us that the "capture of Washington was among the first things laid down upon the rebel *programme*." \* \* \* "To seize the capital and all the departments of the Government; to hold Mr. Buchanan in abject surveillance during the remainder of his term, or, if he should prove too refractory, to eject him for a more serviceable tool; to prevent the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, and make Jefferson Davis, or whoever should be chosen leader of the new *regime*, President—these were the real and avowed purposes of the conspiracy." On what evidence does the reader suppose he asserts this marvelous fiction? Either upon the reports of those notoriously accurate persons, anonymous newspaper-scribblers, or the gasconading of some excited stump-speaker! Or else he absurdly wrests the expressed purpose of the leaders of the Confederacy, *after it became rightfully an independent power*, and had been reluctantly forced into a defensive war, to end that war with the least effusion of blood, by capturing the hostile capital! He also asserts, upon evidence equally baseless, the purpose of the Confederates to reopen the African slave trade; although, as appears, Vol. III. Chap. IX., he had under his eye the unanimous adoption by the Confederacy of a Constitution, which prohibited that trade far more effectively than the Constitution of the United States.

In Vol. III., Chap. XLII., Mr. Wilson gives his version of that act of usurpation and lawlessness, the Emancipation Proclamation. The narrative is singular. He desires to represent this act as the deliberate result of Mr. Lincoln's progress in conscientious conviction and statesmanlike insight. He would fain have us believe that he grew honestly to it from a more defective view. But even the brazen armor of the Wilson forehead seemed to be not quite hard enough for this assertion. He therefore conveys it to us as the testimony of that sheet, always so impartially and correctly informed upon American affairs, the *London Times*. Now, Mr. Wilson can hardly have been more ignorant of the real history of that step than other well-informed contemporaries. He knew that Mr. Lincoln, as well as the Freesoil platform on which he was elected, always and expressly disclaimed the right and purpose to meddle with slavery in the States; that Mr. Lincoln spoke this doctrine and swore to it at his inauguration. He knew that there was no truth what-

ever in the pretext that the right to liberate the seceded States' slaves had emerged as a war power, because he had himself, after his Bull Run footrace, voted solemnly, along with the Congress and President, that the war was not to be prosecuted for purposes of emancipation, but only to restore the Union as it had been; and that Mr. Lincoln had been accustomed to reiterate this doctrine continually, in answer to all the urgency of the Abolitionists. Only a fortnight before the Emancipation Proclamation appeared, he had been urged by a committee of these fanatics to use the war to free the negroes; when the "martyr-President," with the suavity and refinement which were usual with him, made about this reply, as he almost expelled them from his presence: "You must either be fools, or must think me a fool, that you ask me to do this thing which I have no right to do, and which I have sworn I cannot lawfully do. The Constitution does not empower me to make war to free negroes, but to restore the Union." Yet, *in ne fortnight thereafter*, he did the perjured thing! Mr. Wilson doubtless knew the solution of the question, Whence this summersault? The solution was this: that the great British public, though passionately anti-slavery, had at length been so thoroughly awakened (largely through the sagacious efforts of Admiral M. Maury) to the deceitfulness and injustice of the Yankee war; that public opinion was pressing the ministry irresistibly towards that just act, the recognition of the gallant Confederacy. It was then that Lord John Russell, the Liliputian prince of the pettifoggers and Abolitionists, instructed his envoy at Washington, Lord Lyons, to inform Mr. Lincoln's Government that there was no artifice by which the British people could longer be restrained more than a few weeks from recognition, except the playing upon their anti-slavery passions by making the war tangibly a war for abolition. This was the news which caused Mr. Lincoln to hasten to forswear himself. This is precisely the amount of credit which the great "Liberator," and the party he represented, deserved at the hands of their "fellow-citizens of African descent."

Vol. III., Chap. XLVII., contains our author's advocacy and account of the enormous innovation of universal negro suffrage. On p. 672, he intimates that the few sensible men who opposed this perilous measure were very naughty children, in

that they imputed a partisan desire to manufacture voters for the Radical ticket, as the motive. He would have us believe that their motives were the most disinterested possible, and their deliberation the most cautious, patient, and candid; but that, turn whichever way they could, they found themselves shut up to the measure of universal negro suffrage, by their gratitude to the two hundred thousand negro soldiers who had eaten rations for the salvation of "the life of the nation," by the logical consistency of their principles of equality, and above all, by the truculent determination of the "ex-rebels" to trample on the colored man, unless he were defensively armed with the ballot. The Senator should have foreseen how dreadfully this nice story was to be damaged by the "peaching" of an accomplice. Unfortunately, Gen. Sherman, in his most veracious Memoirs, tells us that Mr. Chase, the power behind the throne at Washington, assured him in May, 1865, that it was the purpose of the Government to bestow universal suffrage on the negroes, and avowed the very reason which Mr. Wilson pretends to disclaim. *Sherman's Memoirs*, Vol. II., p. 373.

The author died in 1872, bequeathing to his country the curse of his public career, and this large legacy of error and prejudice, to poison the stream of history for those who believe in him. Since his death, the party whom he represented has been covered with so many infamies by its crimes against liberty and public virtue, that it is becoming hard for even the Yankee mind to conceal from itself the dishonesty of Radicalism. The best, and indeed the only, refutation of false history like this, will be the developments of the future. The day will come when all men will recognize the truth that the freesoil, the warlike, and the reconstruction exploits of Mr. Wilson's party had precisely as much patriotism and sincerity as its *Credit Mobilier*, its salary-grab, its executive and legislative bargains, and its returning boards. This is the only answer to slander of the South, to which the audience for whom he wrote will listen. True as all well-informed men know our criticisms to be, they will pass for nothing with his people at this time.

— It may be asked, Why repeat, then, these futile corrections of pertinacious falsehood, since intelligent men at the South are so fully informed of them, and others will not heed them? We write for the generation of young men now growing up at

the South, to whom the old *regime* can only be known as history. They will be prone to feel, with an ingenuousness natural to the Southern gentleman, as to his fathers, that it is scarcely conceivable a man who had been Vice-President, should write so large a book, so prejudiced and false in its very structure. In the facility of their charity and truthfulness, they will find it hard to appreciate the reality. For their sakes the correct history must be perpetually reasserted, and its falsifications unmasked. The task is a tedious and repulsive one: to refute again oft-refuted slanders and sophisms. But it must be done, or we shall have a generation of sons befooled into Mr. Wilson's venomous estimate of their fathers' deeds, and drugged with his poisonous heresies.

This book impresses the candid reader with several facts and inferences which are consolatory or instructive. Mr. Wilson displays, in his vain-glorious desire to be a martyr for truth, the estimate which respectable and sensible men at the North almost universally held of his party at its origin. He tells us, truthfully, that Abolition was at first denounced, alike by the Senate, the Bench, and the Pulpit, as a crime and a mischievous and senseless fanaticism. The explanation is, that the men of 1833, in the North, while no friends of slavery for their own society, yet knew enough experimentally of its real nature to understand the diabolical wickedness of Abolition. Respectable Northern public men had not then become factionists. They had some respect for law and covenants. They knew what Africans and slavery were. Hence, they knew Abolitionism to be, what it has proved itself, the dire enemy of the Constitution, the African, and the white man, at once. It was only after the school-master and school-marm, the hirelings of a political faction, and its Dugald Dalgettys, the politicating parsons, had educated a new generation upon the *pabulum* of fiction and hatred, that the Wilson tribe began to appear statesmen and patriots, and his libels history.

The attentive reader will rise from the perusal of this book also impressed with another fact: the Freesoil party never designed anything short of the utter overthrow of Southern rights. Every page reveals, directly or indirectly, that it was not free-soil in the territories, but the destruction of the South, which was its real aim. The pretense of the Lincoln platform, that the

right of the States over their own institutions was inviolable, fades away as one reads, into an invisible veil. There is here the consolation that the resistance of the South, which was the occasion, ~~NOT THE CAUSE~~, of so much woe, was not an act of gratuitous heat. It was the work of the Southern masses, and not, as Mr. Wilson pretends to believe, of the leaders. Our leaders were mostly behind the emergency, and were still crying to the people, Peace! when there was no peace. But the honest sense of the people had an intuition of the true state of the crisis; that it was their vital rights which were aimed at. This book convinces the reader again that the people were right.

Mr. Wilson evinces also the vast mischief done to their own section by a certain type of Southern men, once much admired among us. The slaveholder of this class was usually a gentleman of some culture, and by affectation a philanthropist. He had probably been educated at Harvard, Amherst, Yale, or Princeton. Accustomed to the simple, unaffected honesty of Southern cultivated sentiment, and the disinterestedness of Southern patriotism, he was simply incapable of believing in the duplicity and one-sidedness of Northern politics. When his more clear-sighted neighbor cautioned him, his answer was: "For shame! Do not yield to prejudices so bitter." So, in his unsophisticated eyes, all that glittered from the Yankee mint of opinion, passed for gold. He imbibed with docility the fictions which were given him as history, and the pretentious social science which had libels and boasts for its main facts. When he returned from the North, and contrasted its prosperity, bloated with commercial plunderings of the South, and protective tariffs and bounties, and endless jobs, with the leanness of the South, he accepted the solution which his professor of this profitable philosophy had so industriously "dinned into him," that this was the curse of slavery. Thus, so soon as he became a petty politician, he sought occasion to utter the spurious wisdom of his alien teacher. Thus he became, unintentionally, an echo of the slanders of the enemies of his own people. He ascribed to slavery a depression which, but for that most energetic and economical form of labor, would have depopulated the South, and which was really the result of the calculated oppression of New England, through the Federal Congress. He babbled the imaginary political economy of men who never saw

slavery, and who argued from assumed facts which never existed, its impoverishing effects. He was even criminal enough to echo the shameful indictments against the morals of his own people, which had been cunningly thrust into his mouth. No where was this species of nascent politician more prominent than in Virginia, in the Legislature which followed the "Southampton insurrection." These young members ventilated their logic and self-importance by spouting in Richmond all the false facts and absurd theories which they had imported from Yale and Harvard, about "the fearful insecurity of the system, its injustice, its wastefulness, and its debauching effects upon morals." The future found these young gentlemen, indeed, in two widely sundered classes. Those whom Mr. Wilson quotes with most admiration, if they survived, were found among our most despised renegades. The rest, as soon as their beards were grown, learned better wisdom, and with a happy inconsistency, became staunch Southern men. But the mischief was done. They had given the truculent assailants of their fatherland a text. When the most brilliant of them, James McDowell, in his wiser years, essayed to stay the tide of fury and aggression in the Federal Congress, he was answered from his own speeches in the General Assembly of Virginia. And Mr. Wilson has again taken care to embalm all the most extravagant of these declamations in his storehouse of slander, as the testimony of Virginia's own best sons against her. He tells his readers nothing of the other side. He professes his wonder that Virginia, after these emphatic confessions, *did nothing*. He says nothing of the sober logic of wiser men among the Virginians, which speedily blew away all this froth of youthful eloquence, leaving the sober reason of all calmed into the clear truth that the old system was safest, best, and most beneficent to the African. He never heard, we presume, of the masterly essay of President Dew of William and Mary, in which that accomplished man combined the finest resources of the historian, the jurist, and the political economist, to evince the shallowness of the emancipation rhetoric. It was such discussion as this which reassured Virginia and opened the eyes of all her young anti-slavery men, save such as were ripening into future scalawags. But meantime they had slandered their own mother, and her embittered enemies will take good care not to let the slanders die.



In conclusion, one rises from the perusal of this book with a mournful impression. What must be the future of a people, the majority of whom accept such writings as this for history? This science is the very eye of statesmanship. With false history for pilot, can the ship of state land anywhere but on the breakers? That people which "lives, breathes, and has its being" in an enveloping atmosphere of falsehood in history and *opisms* in philosophy, has nothing before it but to unlearn its heresies in a fearful school of experience. And what prospect has the South for just or even merciful rule, when subjugated by a people who believe Senator Wilson's black representations about us? *His book has passed already through four editions.* The disdainful and imperious North, pleased to see those whom she has violently crushed accused of all guilty things, will never condescend to look at any reply, until a retributive Providence compels her to read it in the calamitous fruits of her creed.

## FREE SCHOOLS.<sup>1</sup>

---

Have you seen a single, sensible tax-payer, not a small politician, and thus a suitor for impecunious votes, nor a selfish beneficiary of the plunder disbursed by our school system, who does not denounce the whole measure as unjust and mischievous? I have not. The plan has been tried and found wanting. The careful observer of Northern opinion sees that while the demagogues, lay and clerical, still shout for the system, in order to catch the populace, thoughtful men in the North are more radically dissatisfied with it every year, as an expedient for American commonwealths. I could fill quite a scrap book, with reflections of leading Northerners, upon the failure of the system as a diffuser of any real intelligence; upon its tendencies to degrade American literature and obstruct better education (outside the cities) upon the evident increase of crime and incendiary opinions under this system; upon its obvious bearing to rear up an atheistic generation of people and prepare for America a reign of terror; and upon its futility even to diffuse the art and practice of reading among the laboring masses. Such a scrap-book might be edifying reading for our Utopians. It seems very likely, that they have persuaded Virginia to put on the costly shoes of the Yankees, in this matter, just when they are getting ready to kick them off with disgust.

Their consciousness of the strength of our arguments against their pet plan is clearly betrayed in the false issues they raise. Because we see that this pretended way of education is fallacious, dangerous and wasteful, we are the "enemies of education," forsooth! Let us see if even their reluctant heads may not be forced to admit, that a man may be a true and hearty friend of a good work, and yet, *for that very reason*, all the more opposed to a pretended, mischievous, false way of promoting it: It is presumed that the State Commissioner for instance, is a true friend of the evangelization of all the people, and espec-

---

1—Appeared in *Southern Planter and Farmer*, January, 1879.

ially of the poor and ignorant. Consistency, therefore, makes him an advocate of an established Church to do the evangelizing, does it? Let him speak out! If he says he is not the advocate of evangelization by State-action, and yet the ardent advocate of evangelization, then I ask, by what monopoly of candor or honesty does he, while claiming this for himself, impugn our motives, when we say that we are ardent advocates of the true education of the poor and ignorant (have been working for it all our lives); and yet not advocates of education by direct, State-action? And while on this point, I will add another question: If a man reasons consistently, must not the State-school men's logic, from the admitted importance of education, to their State scheme, also lead every Christian to advocate a State establishment of Christianity? Why not? And does the Superintendent remember an occasion, at which I was present, when a citizen of Virginia, eminent for moderation, wisdom, age and benignity of character, made him admit that very conclusion, as, under certain circumstances following from his positions?

This suggests a point against our present plan, whose formidable character is now making thoughtful men at the North, and in Britain, tremble. The Redeemer said, "He that is not with me is against me." There cannot be a moral neutrality. Man is born with an evil and ungodly tendency. Hence a non-religious training must be an anti-religious training. The more of this, the larger curse. But the American commonwealth has expressly pledged herself to a non-religious attitude. Hence, she cannot, by her State-action, endow or inculcate a particular religion. While the population of some States was homogeneous, this radical difficulty was not seriously felt: the people of a Protestant State, like Connecticut, could quietly overstep the true history of their own constitution, in favor of Protestantism; and there was nobody to protest. But now we have Papists, Unitarians, Chinese, Jews and Atheists by the myriads; and they will not acquiesce in the wielding of State-power, in which they have equal rights, for the partial advantage of a creed to which they are opposed. The result will be, that their protests will triumph, as they now do, in many States; and we shall have a generation of practical atheists reared "on State account"; just as clear-sighted men in the North see they have on their hands

there, rapidly preparing for them another *sans culotte* revolution.

In previous discussion, it was also shown, that the system of State-schools is agrarian, or communistic, confiscating the property of one class of citizens for the private and domestic behoof of another. The justice of this charge none know better than those who mix with the people; the power to make the rich man educate their children is the main feature which commends the system to the non-taxpaying voters. It is valued by them as a method of plunder. We have also shown that the system is levelling, and attempts an impossibility: to give all the people literary occupations; whereas in all countries, and in spite of universal schools, it is found that the laboring class does not read, and does not wish to read. It was shown that the scheme confounds education with a knowledge of a few literary arts (reading, writing, etc.) which are not education, but only possible means thereof; and in the case of the laboring poor, far the most questionable, and least efficient means of true education. The tendency of the State's interference was shown to be, to degrade the standard of literary education, while diffusing its poorest elements: since we see good schools disappear as the primary ones are multiplied. The degradation of literature follows from the same cause, by reason of the attempt to supply a grovelling or shallow literature for the multitude of minds one-tenth part educated. It was proved by stubborn facts, that common schools have multiplied crime and pauperism, by a natural influence, suggesting to the laboring classes new wants, without increasing in them the power of moral self control or the means of lawful indulgence. And the dishonesty of their advocates has been again and again exposed, in continuing to appeal to their deceptive cry, "Better economy to build school-houses than jails"; after *it has been proved to them, that the multiplication of their school-houses has multiplied the jails.* The fearful dangers to the morals of children, by promiscuous minglings in these schools, has been pointed out; and are receiving confirmations in many parts of the country, in the spread of abuses too gross to be ventilated in public. The certainty that our schools will be perverted by demagogues for party purposes, was pointed out; and was illustrated by facts; while the intolerable and tyrannical nature of this usurpation

was displayed. Last: the lights of the wiser statesmanship of better days were adduced, to show how perilous it is to fix on the community any system whatsoever, the nature of which is, to subsidize many persons, by giving them a selfish, pecuniary interest in the perpetuation of it, or of its abuses. For, should the system prove unwise, or should new circumstances require its change or repeal, the self-interest of all these subsidized classes will prompt them to clamor and defraud the public mind, so as to make the needed repeal impossible or extremely difficult.

The course of this discussion has added a pungent illustration to the power of our last argument. No sooner was discriminating inquiry turned upon the new system, than it was discovered that it had already bribed so many classes, other than tax-payers, that candid and patriotic discussion was hopeless. A State Superintendent in the metropolis, a county Superintendent in each county, with his gang of petty tax gatherers, his school board for each "township," his company of schoolmasters and schoolmarms, with their whole cohort of pauper parents, at once waked up to the fact that their much be praised system enabled them very conveniently to keep their hands in the pockets of other people. All these joined, in many places, in raising a mercenary clamor, which has drowned fair discussion. And our minute politicians, in whose breasts votes are the breath of life, are seen so intimidated, that hardly one of them dares whisper a doubt against the idol of the socialists. The manner in which this debate has been conducted by many of these petty place holders would have been enough, were Virginia what she once was, to overwhelm the whole affair with righteous disgust and indignation. Citizens who have the right of tax-payers, to be heard touching their rights, and State-affairs; who are, in many cases venerable for grey hairs, for experience, for integrity, and for long lives of labor and sacrifice for the honor of Virginia, have been seen yelped after by these officials (whose only known service to the State has been drawing salaries wrung from it by a grinding taxation), with obloquy and ridicule. This is an indecency which deserves only chastisement.

The time was, when Virginian officials had manners and principle enough to keep silent in a debate touching their own

emoluments; they felt that delicacy, not to say common decency, prompted the leaving of such questions to be considered by that larger part of the citizens who had no pecuniary interest in the issue. The time was, when Virginia had a righteous constitution, the work of statesmen and not of demagogues; and that instrument contained this provision: That no member of a Legislature which debated and decided the creation of a salaried office, should take office under the act creating it. The reason of this excellent law was, that the very indecency on which I remark might be made impossible, at least, in the Legislature; that no man, when handling the rights of his fellow-citizens and of the State, should run even a risk of having his judgment warped by a pecuniary and personal consideration. But we have now seen all this indecent clamor from the throats of paid officials; and we have seen the School Commissioner actually employing the people's money to flood the State with *ex-parte* documents and arguments, designed to forestall the expression of the people's judgment as to measures in debate before them, and liable to be justly condemned by them. All that the school law, bad as it is, could pretend to create such officials for, was, to execute the provisions of the law. But under the thin pretext of diffusing information about education, they misapply the people's money to the work of manufacturing, in Virginia, a Yankee public sentiment, alien to the genius and traditions of Virginia, promotive of the continuance of their personal emoluments! And Virginians stand this?

The utter inadequacy of the pretext for universal negro schooling was also pointed out; that "as they are to vote, it is our duty and interest to educate them into intelligent voters." We showed that primary education, larger than that given to our negroes, had utterly failed to make intelligent voters out of the white proletariat of the North, and we urged this plain, honest query: *What right have they to promise Virginia that a smaller dose of their physis which we see only impotent and mischievous there, will do any good here?* The facts they dare not deny; but at the plain, stubborn question they refuse to look. Blinking that, they only repeat the refuted pretext, an average specimen of the honesty of the logic. The radical nature of the perils attending negro suffrage was pointed out to them, from difference of color and race, alien blood, race an-

tipathies, savage morals, total absence of property-stake in the common weal, subjection to poisonous and malignant outside influences; and it was asked, Will such *a mite of the arts of reading and spelling*, as Virginia free negro children are going to retain, be *any remedy* at all for these strong perils? Every man's common sense answers: Just as trustworthy as a minute bread pill for the yellow-fever! Every man's common sense also shows him, that while this sham-schooling will be utterly futile for the end proposed, it *will be* efficacious for harm, by giving young negroes pretext for the idleness and the false expectations which are their and our great perils. The art of reading may be quite a good thing for him who uses it aright, but these young negroes are in perishing need of learning many things which are, for them, infinitely more momentous than this questionable boon, and which these baubles of schools fatally prevent their learning; how to turn a good furrow, how to make an honest day's work, how to groom a horse, how to cook a wholesome loaf, how to wash a shirt, how to whet a scythe, how to mow an acre of grass per day, and *above* all, how to live without stealing. We solemnly tell the school-men that they are giving the country a generation of young negroes whose inevitable destiny is to work or steal, whom they are so rearing, that they neither wish to work nor know how. The property-men of the country cannot hire them, because they know nothing useful to an employer; and the young negroes would not hire themselves if they were fit for anything. Come, gentlemen, lay aside utopianisms, and sophisms, and "false facts," and tell us, if you please, what Virginia is to do with a half million of young negroes thus trained to impotency, when the old generation, *educated by slavery* are gone? Give each one of them a school to teach? Will they not all have the natural wants and desires of human beings? Neither able nor willing to work, will they not take? Can poor, impoverished Virginia stand up under so much lettered pauperism? Will not the alternatives be universal bankruptcy or anarchical resistance? The question is solemn and urgent.

We urge, again, the burning injustice of the present law, taxing the former owners, after plundering them, for the pretended education of negroes—Virginia had her own system for educating her negroes. It was a good system, approved by two

centuries of experience. It turned miserable savages into a decent, useful, Christian peasantry. It even diffused fully as much of the arts of letters as the Africans were in a condition to profit by! For it is well known that every young negro slave who showed any worthy aspiration at all was usually taught to read in his master's family. It was a system of education, solemnly sanctioned by the laws, human and divine, and guaranteed to us by the Federal Constitution and the enactments of Congress. Well, it suited the invader's purposes of ambition to tear down our good, old, legalized, beneficent system of education for the negro, and to confiscate our property in him, thus reducing the white community to the verge of destitution. And then, the oppressor turns around and taxes us, already so ruthlessly injured, for means to attempt a new, expensive and worthless system for repairing the ruin which he had himself perpetrated in destroying the well tried and lawful system! The destruction of the good, old system was his work—a work wrought exclusively for his own aggressive ends. Let him bear the cost of repairing his own mischief. There was wickedness enough in the doing of it, in all conscience. But now, when he turns upon the injured party, and again plunders them, under the pretense of taking means to repair his own first crime, the wrong is "rank and smells to heaven." I see not how any righteous mind in Virginia can have anything to do with it, except to protest, while he unavoidably submits.

Hence it is, that when any white man among us pretends to be an *ex animo* approver of this plan, my common sense compels me to be a skeptic as to his sincerity. The old Irish fish-woman tried to persuade her customer that the eels rather liked skinning; but the eels never said so; and had one of them professed satisfaction with the process *pr see*, I should have persisted in the doubt whether he were a candid and truthful eel. From this point of view, the sensible reader sees that the very inception of this State-school matter in Virginia stamped its motive with insincerity. The "Underwood Constitution" itself, thrust down Virginia's throat as it was, by the breech of Provost Marshal's musket, did not require the Legislature to put any system of State schools in operation until 1876. Every patriotic reason should have prompted us to wait as long as our masters allowed us. The State was in a condition of finan-



cial exhaustion, which made any breathing time, however short, a boon to her; and her credit was already staggering under a load she could but just carry. There was no experience anywhere in the world, to guide a Legislature in such a problem as the Underwood Constitution imposed; the education of two different and hostile races on the same soil and in the same system, and in Virginia, there was a total lack of experimental knowledge of State education on the Yankee-plan. It would have been most beneficial to wait a season, and thus gain the benefit of other's experiments. Our conquerors, whose imperious will imposed this plan on us, then had the full fever of their hatred and triumphs on their spirits. Every year that passed was likely to abate something of their fury, and take some of the "wire-edge" off their despotism, so as to hold out the hope that in 1876 they would be less exacting of their subjects than in 1870. At least, one would have thought, the Legislature, driven by their masters to so vast, expensive and untried a work, would proceed tentatively, during the six years of grace, and risque only small experiments, until they had felt their way. The propriety of delay is evinced by this plain question: Does anybody dream, that in 1876, after the Funding Bill, after all the experiences, the disappointed hopes, the decline in real estate, the ebbing of resources of those six disastrous years, any Legislature could have been mad enough to commit the State to the cumbrous and costly *incubus* fixed on us by the action of 1870? Nobody. The blunder would have become impossible by 1876. Well, all that we might have gained by the experience of those six years, with five millions of dollars (spent on these sham-schools), which might either have paid off one-sixth of our whole debt, saving the State's credit; or, if left in the people's hands, might have fecundated private enterprise all over the State; all this our Legislature threw away in 1870, by its precipitate, superserviceable zeal in carrying out the orders of our conquerors. Why did they thus run six years ahead of their master's own orders, in the face of all these obvious considerations for delay? *To buy votes for themselves* in county elections; to disarm the objections of radical demagogues, who were hounding on the negro voters after the spoils of the promised school-system; to ingratiate themselves with the non-tax-paying voters, by giving them speedily this pretext for

thrusting their hands into their neighbor's pockets. Thus the system was begun, not in wisdom or patriotism, but in self seeking. Is it asserted that it was necessary to throw this "tub to the whale" at once in order to appease radicalism and save the State government from its clutches? I reply by the question: *Was radicalism appeased?* Did it not wield the whole negro vote substantially, notwithstanding the "tub?" The State was saved from its foul clutch, not by any appeasing or dividing of its greed, but in spite of that greed. Had the ruler of the State and the leaders of the Conservative party then assumed a quiet, honest position they would have met the clamor for precipitating the school-system thus: "When the stipulated time comes, we shall duly perform the covenant, which a hard necessity has forced us to agree to. The poverty of the State and the true interests of both races forbid our anticipating the task. No obligation exist to do so, consequently no charge of bad faith can lie for our not doing so." This honest attitude would have been so impregnable that it would have put the Conservative party in a far better position before its enemy than it ever gained from its cowardly haste and rashness.

But I have still more practical objections to make against our present school-laws and their administration. I charge that, even if we granted the propriety of the Yankee theory of universal common-school education on State account and under State control; even if the Underwood Constitution were right in this thing—which I utterly deny—still our present system is wicked, tyrannical, wasteful and unnecessarily burdensome to an impoverished people, and comparatively inefficient as an execution of its advocates' own false theory. If it be granted that theory is to prevail in Virginia, still the present school-laws and their administration are flagrantly vicious, and call for the reform of the Legislature. This I shall prove in a practical way, by comparing it with actual results in the present and the past. My argument will proceed on the maxim, that what has been done by others in the same circumstances, can be done by Virginia.

First. I bring our boasters to the test of a comparison with the existing system in the State of Georgia, the "Empire State of the South." Georgia, like us, has been forced by her conquerors to embark in the Yankee theory of universal primary

education on State account and under State control. The vital article of their present Constitution compelling this is as follows:\*

"There shall be a thorough system of common schools for the education of children in the elementary branches of our English education only, as nearly uniform as practicable, the expenses of which shall be provided for by taxation or otherwise. The schools shall be free to all children of the State, but separate schools shall be provided for the white and colored races."

The revenues provided by the Constitution and laws, to support all the schools, \*\* are the poll tax, the interest on the existing school fund, a special tax on shows, a tax on the sale of liquors, a dog tax, and half the net earnings of the "State railroad."

*No property tax is laid*, either on State or local account, on any real or personal property of individuals, to support common schools. Thus the grand iniquity of our agrarian system is avoided. Even the Legislature is sternly inhibited from authorizing any local taxations, by any local authority whatsoever, for school purposes, until the tax has been expressly approved by *two-thirds* of the voters of the locality (city, or county, or town). Even this guarded power *the Legislature has hitherto wisely refused to grant*; and so far *no property tax is wrested* from any one citizen to help to educate another man's family.

Now let us contrast our "bill of abominations." The Legislature,\* in addition to the income of the "literary fund" and certain escheats and fines, levies on all property, for a general or State school fund, a direct tax of ten cents per \$100 annually. But this outrage is only the small beginning. The county school board may also tax all property in the county to the same rate; and the "district school board," the littlest and last gradation of petty tyranny, the three trustees of a township, may exercise this highest attribute of sovereignty, and tax their (fellow-citizens, I was about to write, erroneously) *subjects*, to the rate of ten cents on the \$100 of all property! Thus, besides the other

\*Const. of Ga., Art. viii. § 1.

\*\*Const. Art. vii. § 3; Pub. Sch. Laws of Ga.

†31: Const. Art. viii. § 4. Sch. Report of Ga., 1887, p. 12.

\*\*\*School Law of Va. codified," pp. 19, 22; Act of Assembly Jan. 11. 1877. "School Laws codified," p. 27.

very considerable exactions which come ultimately from the people, we have property taxed 30 cents on every \$100, to educate the children of those who pay no tax, or nearly none. This is *three-fourths* of all the property tax the State of Virginia used to require for all the ends of government, in the days of her glory and greatness; and *three-fifths* of all that she now exacts for all her other purposes, in these days of enormous and reckless taxation and expenditure! But who are the "county board" and the "district board?" The "district board" is one of three "trustees" for the townships, *appointed by the county superintendent, county court (judge), and commonwealth's attorney!* And who appoints the "county superintendent?" The State school board nominally—Dr. Ruffner actually, according to his own admission.\*\* And the county judge? He is elected for a term of years by the Legislature. And the commonwealth's attorney? He is elected by the non-tax-paying voters of his county; in my county, elected by pauper negroes. And who is the "county school board?" These little office-holders, thus appointed of the several townships, with the county superintendent again, constitute the "county school board." Thus the power of taxing the people, the most important function of sovereignty, is entrusted to persons with whose appointment the people can have nothing direct to do. This is an outrage against the first principle of free government: *that representation must accompany taxation.* True, this county board is directed by law to report their proposed levies to the county "board of supervisors," who are elected by the people, i. e., by the non-tax-paying voters; in our county, by the pauper negroes. But in this matter of the school levies, this board of supervisors is, to the school board, only what a "*lit de justice*" was to Louis XIV. of France. It can hear, register and enforce their majesties' edicts, and hound on the constable who sells the last cow of the white widow of a Confederate soldier to play at schooling the brats of negroes who are stealing out of the field the poor little crop of corn she has tilled with the hands of her fatherless boys. The law itself is so worded as constructively to *enjoin* the supervisors to ordain whatever levies the school board demands, provided it does not pass the *maximum* limit.\*

\* \* Va. School Rep., 1877, p. 15. "The work and responsibility are thrown on him by the other members of the Board."  
 \*\* See School Laws codified, §64, 4: "It shall be the duty of said Board, . . . to levy," etc.

Why this outrage on the principles of free government? The nature of the Underwood Constitution is to make each township a corporation for township purposes. *Why did no, the law allow the township corporation, like all other corporations in the land, to elect its own officers?* Ah, the concocters of the tyranny did not mean to allow the sacred principle, for which our fathers fought, to hold here, for fear the citizens in the townships should use their right of election to protect their property from plunder under the name of school tax! One might have thought that they had sufficient guarantee of lavish taxation, in the universal and the negro suffrage prevailing in the townships, where the voters who pay no property tax have the power of a majority, to vote away the property of the minority who do pay. But this sweeping and ruthless power, wicked as it is, was not enough for the artificers of our system; so, to make sure that property shall be absolutely helpless, under the robbery designed, they also sundered representation from taxation, and gave the taxing power, in township and county, to persons not elected by the tax payers. Our system is worse than those of the Yankees, from whom our school men seem so greedy to borrow; for, while the major part of the school money in the Yankee States usually comes from the local taxes, the rights of townships and their citizens in assenting to those taxes are more respected. The township there is a little republic, and exercises the rights of one; ours are in names, corporations, but helpless corpses in fact, under the exactions of these officials with their foreign appointments.

Once more; bad as the laws are, I have the personal evidence, that these irresponsible exactors are capable of transcending those laws. They actually made me pay in Prince Edward county, for 1877, to the State ten cents on every \$100 for school purposes. To the county and district jointly twenty cents on every \$100 of my real estate in Prince Edward, and 26 9-10 on every \$100 of my personal property. I have the county treasurer's receipt for this lawless plunder (6 9-10 cents per \$100 more than the maximum allowed by their own tyrannical laws) in my desk. It may be satisfying to the curious to know how much tax a countryman pays who has no municipal taxes and no municipal privileges. On my little mite of real estate: To the State, county and schools, 105 cents on every

\$100 of value. On my personal property to the State, county and school, 127 6-10 cents on every \$100 of value, besides my separate income tax. This is quite near enough to confiscation, especially on real estate which yields the owner just 0 *per cent.* annually. Of course there is no redress. Every well informed person knows that this is just the kind of oppression which John Hampton resisted in the famous case of the ship-money, and which ultimately cost Charles I. his head. But the despotism in Virginia is so much more crushing than that of the absolutist king, that any man who made a stand for his rights here would be simply laughed at.

Now, the point of my comparison is, that Georgia is as distinctly committed to the wrong system of universal State-schools as Virginia is. Yet Georgia can set up that system without trampling, in this way, on the rights of the people. The Legislature of Georgia could at least avoid that self-evident enormity, of enabling the non-tax-paying majority to vote away the money of the paying minority without redress to the latter. She did at least avoid the wickedness of so legislating, as that the power of levying and disbursing property-taxes should be placed in the hands of one class of the people who do not pay; while the necessity of paying taxes is imposed on a distinct class—those who own property. If this is not “class-legislation”—the essence of oligarchy—I know not what is. Georgia, knowing that, with universal white and negro suffrage, the class who pay no property tax must always be in the majority, wisely refuses to levy any property tax for schools. The only general tax she allows to be levied on her people for this communistic purpose is a poll-tax, in which rich and poor pay alike.

Now, if we must have the Yankee system, why cannot our Legislature imitate the wisdom and moderation of Georgia? Let all property-taxes, State and local, for school purposes, be abolished. Let the poll-tax be dedicated to that use, with the proviso, that the parent must at least pay the poll-tax, in order to enter his children. And, if this would not make a sum sufficiently splendid for our enthusiasts, let us imitate Georgia again, and devote the liquor-tax to the schools. The Auditor estimated that the Moffett law, properly applied, would yield \$600,000. Is not that, added to the poll-tax and the income of

the literary fund, enough to glut the rapacious maw of the School Board? Give them this; and we shall at least have the consolation of knowing, that we are not plundered to support a mischievous system, unless we choose to commit the folly of tipping.

The powers given these petty officials by our laws are also tyrannical in the matter of school buildings and fixtures.\* These officers, practically irresponsible to the people, decide that any building they please are needed, and the people are taxed, "will they, nill they" to build them.\* The county Superintendent is armed with the power of condemning a building, already paid for by the people's money, and disposing of it. He who does not see here openings for corrupt robbery must be blind indeed. I know that officials may be found, who do not build or alienate school-houses for jobbery, and who endeavor to consult the poverty of their people. But the system is evil, in that it gives the power to unscrupulous men; in that it applies the temptation to human nature. And I know that abuses do exist, showing cruel oppression of our burdened tax-payers. I know of a school-house, needlessly built, against the advice and protest of discreet tax-payers, in a township of honest country people almost bankrupted already by taxes, occupied by a pretended school one or two seasons, and since standing empty, except as used, without authority, for a tobacco barn! How many hundreds of such cases exist? The people are so tired out and crushed with oppressions, that they are too languid to protest; and such doings pass *sub silentio*.

But now, let us compare the cost of our schools, and those of Georgia; a vital point when our State is hovering over insolvency.† Georgia spends, in one year, \$434,046.‡ Virginia spends, for one year, \$1,050,346!!!! Georgia is the undiminished Empire State of the South, with \_\_\_\_\_ of population, and \_\_\_\_\_ millions of taxable property. Virginia is shorn of one-third the dimensions by dismemberment and claims only \_\_\_\_\_ millions of taxable values.

Again,§ the total expense of working the system in Georgia is \$6,390.58. The expense of working our system is, ||by

\*School Laws codified, § 40-44.

\*School Laws codified, § 42-43.

†Georgia School Rep. for 1876, p. —, p. 8, p. 8 again.

‡Virginia School Rep. for 1877, p. 7, pp. 5, 6.

§Georgia School Rep. for 1876, p. —, p. 8, p. 8 again.

||Virginia School Rep. for 1877, p. 7, pp. 5, 6.

the Superintendent's own figures, \$170,837.78. This includes *nothing for building school-houses; all this immense sum goes for salaries, fees and rents, etc.* Is it any longer a surprise to the people of Virginia, that there is an indecent and vicious resistance to all amendments, on the part of this well-pampered crew? The number of children in Georgia (of both colors) between the ages of six and eighteen is reported<sup>¶</sup> to be 394,037, the number enrolled was 179,405, and the actual average number in the schools was 115,121. In Virginia (see reference above) the number of both colors between five and twenty-one years, was said to be 482,789 (the difference of 88,752 in favor of Virginia would be more than offset by the children between five and six, and between eighteen and twenty-one, not enumerated in Georgia), and the average actually taught last year was 117,843. That is to say: our Virginia system teaches but 2,722 more children than the Georgian system, but costs our distressed State nearly twice and a half as much money. *Why cannot our system be wrought as cheaply as the Georgian?* Look at the enormous salary-list on our plan:\* Salary for State Superintendent; salaries for his clerks; office expenses at the seat of government; salaries for a cohort of county Superintendents, at the tune of \$300 for each of the first ten thousands of souls in his county, and \$20 for each subsequent thousand; so that a county of eighteen thousand souls pays for these few duties a salary of \$460: salaries to clerks of county boards and district boards; salaries for Treasurers, *per diems* for district trustees, salaries for the enumerators of children; so that, for every four dollars and fifty cents which reaches the teachers—the men who *do all the real work*—one dollar of the people's money is stopped on the way to grease the palm of some blatant advocate of the system, who teaches no child at all. But, on the Georgian plan, the county Superintendent receives no pay but a small *per diem* for the days actually devoted to his duties; and the county boards no pay at all, except exemption from jury and road-services. *Why cannot Virginians serve the cause of education as cheaply as Georgians?*

Again, the monthly cost of the Georgian child for school-

<sup>¶</sup>Georgia School Rep. for 1876, p.—, p. 8, p. 8 again.

\*Va. School Rep. 1877, p. 7. School Laws codified, § 73, p. 27, p. 21. Act of Assembly, March 29, 1877.



ing is 84 1-3 cents. The monthly cost of the Virginia child is \$1.40.

Or, let us take this view of the economy of our system. The average pay of primary male teachers in Virginia is \$33.10 per month; of female teachers, \$27.37 per month. But private parties have no difficulty in employing young ladies, of liberal culture, who actually teach the higher English branches, Latin, French and music at prices ranging from \$12 to \$15 per month with board. Every country housekeeper knows that the board of a young lady in his family does not add \$10 per month to his actual expenses. So that private parties can get competent persons to teach the higher branches for \$22, when the State gives \$27.37 for teaching the plainest rudiments. Yet the boast was that the State would do the work so much more economically! There are *accomplished ladies* now in Virginia laboring long hours in schools unendowed by the State, at \$150 per year without board. Negro fellows, on the other hand, who would think themselves well paid at \$8 per month in the field, and young negro women who would be satisfied with \$5 per month in the laundry, are paid \$33 and \$27 per month, while white ladies are reduced to work for \$12 or \$15. No wonder the system is popular with negroes and office-holders.

One other excellent feature of the Georgia law is secured by the very Constitution of the State—Art. viii. Sec. 5. "Nothing contained in Sec. 1 of this Art. shall be construed to deprive schools in this State, not common schools, from participation in the educational funds of the State, as to all pupils therein, taught in the elementary branches of an English education."

The meaning of this provision is, that all schools created and regulated by parents themselves, shall have the same title to a share in the school fund to pay for instruction in the English rudiments with those created by the State, provided the teachers of the former come under a few simple regulations ensuring the useful performance of their duties. The vital advantage of this is, that the State of Georgia restricts and limits that intrusion into and usurpation of parental rights and responsibilities within the narrowest limits permitted by her conquerors, which our system studies to push to the most sweeping and enormous extent. The State of Georgia recognizes the right of parents to say where a school is needed, how it shall

be regulated, who shall be its teacher, what shall be its textbooks, what its moral or religious regimen. The State of Virginia does all that can be done to wrest these inalienable rights and duties from the parents to whom God and nature have given them, and vest them in three "school trustees." The State of Georgia says to parents: "Exercise your rights of choice, and the Commonwealth will acquiesce and pay the portion of the fund equitably due your families, to the teacher of your choice." The State of Virginia virtually says: "I claim, like pagan Sparta, to be parent of all children, and to usurp the rights of natural parents in dictating by my officials, where, how, and by whom your children shall be educated; and if any parent insist on his rights of doing his own natural duties to his own offspring, he shall be punished therefor, by having his property taken from him to educate other people's children in ways he did not elect." There is the difference.

The experience of every practical man will teach him how conducive this feature of the Georgia law is to flexibility, convenience and economy. The parents of a neighborhood create a school; they are the best judges where it should be situated, and who had best teach it; for they are actuated by disinterested love for the children, and sound common sense. They furnish the house and the appliances. Hence, every dollar the State contributes is applied to the cost of actual instruction. The plan has the flexibility needed for a sparse population; the wishes of parents, desiring higher tuition for their children, co-operate with the wishes of the State desiring primary tuition for all; and public and private interests work together for the mutual benefit of the property-class and the poor.

It may be claimed, that a similar thing is sometimes done in Virginia. If it is, it is done informally, and outside the provisions of our iron system. The instances speak well, not for the system, but for the good sense and right feeling of some of the officials.

Let us now proceed to compare our system with the former system bequeathed by our wise fathers. Before the war, it was much the fashion with the Utopians to belabor that system with abuse, as inefficient and partial. But experience now proves that the results were every whit as complete and useful as the results of our present oppressive plan, while the old

one has the unspeakable advantages of economy and foundation in right principles.

According to the report of William A. Moncure, Second Auditor, the literary fund of Virginia accomplished in 1858 the following results: The number of schools assisted in Virginia was 3,847. The number of poor children sent to school was 54,232. The average attendance of these children was not quite twelve weeks, or three months of school time. The average annual cost of the tuition and books of each child was \$2.96, or about \$1 per month for the time actually spent in study. And the total cost of the system to the State was only \$160,530. The addition made for the expenses of administration seems to have been, in all, \$18,047, if we rightly infer from the Second Auditor's figures. The whole expenses of the central administration were but \$2,750 (as against \$5,819 in 1877), and the only other salaried agents were the county superintendents, who received, what one of them calls in his report, a "little pittance." "School commissioners," in all the counties, performed their duties gratuitously, and were prompt and proud to do so from philanthropy and patriotism. *Why cannot this be done now?* The Reports from all the counties, while recognizing defects, and admitting that the results were incomplete, yet inform the government of the general popularity and progressive utility of the system. But now, the general verdict which comes up from disinterested and intelligent men in all quarters is, that our present system is an expensive, mischievous and cruel sham.

*Per contra*, it claims, in the School Report of 1877, to have given, on an average, four and a half months' tuition to 117,843 children, at an average monthly cost of \$1.43 per month, and at a total cost to the State of \$1,050,346. While the cost of administration of the old system was but \$18,000, the expense of working the new has been \$170,800! If we regarded the number of pupils alone, the old system did nearly *half the work* (54,232 children then, 117,843 now) *for less than one-fifth of the money!* Look at that! \$178,577 then, against \$1,050,346 now. Then Virginia was rich; now she is poor. The cost of administration was then, absolutely, a little over one-tenth of what it is now; and relatively to the numbers taught, about one-fourth of the present.

An attempt will be made to break the terrible force of this comparison of facts by reviving the complaints which our Utopians used to utter against the incompleteness of our old system. The plea will be that, if the system was cheap, its fruits were very poor. We shall again hear the old complaints as to the great irregularity in attendance, the listlessness of parents and pupils, the scantiness of the letters actually gained, etc., etc., etc. But the answer is: First, that this imperfection of results, which was true of the old system, if it argues anything, argues the folly of the State's attempting to cure in the popular masses the disease of ignorance, indolence and apathy, by any such *quantum* of the arts of letters as the State can give on any system. If the former results argue anything, they argue the just application to the whole subject of the maxim, "One man can take a horse to water, but a hundred cannot make him drink"; they only show what we have all along urged—that to inspire aspiration, punctuality, industry, a conscientious use of privileges and acquirements, is what the State has no means of doing, and without these, any appliances, or any plan, are wasted.

But second, the answer is, that our new system, with all its tyranny and crushing expense, yields fruits just as imperfect. Were the children of the indigent then listless and irregular in attendance? *They are so still!* Was the tincture of letters then given very small? *It is smaller now.* The old system did not profess to deal with any but indigent white children. Of these, the Commonwealth then contained about 97,000; and of these, 54,232 were not only enrolled, but actually sent to school. Our present system undertakes to provide for 482,789 children and youths. Of these, it has not enrolled even more than 205,000, and it only pretends to have taught, at all, 117,843. Talk of imperfect results! The old system was energy and perfection compared with this! The old system had so far overtaken its destined work as to give nearly three months' schooling to *more than half* the whole mass of youth for which it was designed; while the new system has not enrolled nearly half of its appointed mass, and *has not given any instruction to three-fourths* of its appointed charge. Even as to the enrolled youth, we have a betrayal of its inefficiency, and of the abounding listlessness and irregularity of its beneficiaries. The pres-

ent law makes the compensation of the teachers depend on the actual attendance, rather than the numbers claimed on the school-rolls. The law says that a teacher shall not be maintained, unless an actual average of sixteen daily is in attendance. Now, it is very well known among the teachers, that, unless they have a roll of not less than thirty pupils, it is usually vain to hope for an actual average attendance of sixteen. What does this mean? That on any average day, when sixteen are in place long enough to be counted, fourteen are truant. That tells the whole tale as to the wretched results of our present organization. Dr. Ruffner's figures tell the same miserable story. Of all the youth of school age, only 24.4 *per cent.* attend school on an average; and of those enrolled, only 57 1-2 per cent. attend. (In round numbers, 205,000 are enrolled; 118,000 have attended. Now as 118,000 : 205,000 :: 57 1-2 : 100.)

Here, again, are the stubborn facts, showing that the old Virginian system was as much more efficient as it was cheaper. But we shall see our Utopians, with their usual candor, persistently averting their eyes from the facts while they go on with their baseless boasting. Why will our authorities, with this clear light of experience before them, still prefer the bad system to the good? If they do, the people will understand why: *Because the system is worked for the advantage of the office holder, and not of the State.* That will be clear to the people's common sense.

I have now shown our legislators two plans—the Georgian, and the old plan of Virginia—both of which have been tried, and either of which is immeasurably better than the one that curses us. This system of our fathers had superiority in its principles, as great as in its practical workings. Of these, I will, in concluding, present two. One was, that the State government left to parents those powers and rights which are theirs by the laws of God and nature, and which cannot be usurped by a just, free government: those of directing the rearing of their own children, and choosing its agents and methods. *Clusters of parents* were left to create schools, to elect teachers, to ordain the instruction and discipline. When the parents had used their prerogatives, then the State came in as a modest ally and assistant, and by providing for the teaching in those schools of such children as their helpless poverty made proper wards

of the State's charity, helped on the work of education, and supplied that destitution which private charity did not reach. There was a system conformed to the good old doctrine of our fathers, that "governments are the servants of the people." But the present plan proceeds on the doctrine of despots, that the *people are the servants of the government*. Parents are bidden to stand aside, and betray their rights and duties, while little State officials usurp their powers of creating schools, electing teachers, and ordaining methods.

The other was, that our wise fathers, by this simple plan, resolved the otherwise insoluble difficulty about the religion of the schools, which is now involving the friends of State education in the North and in Europe, in inexplicable entanglements. On the one hand, if the State is to act fairly and honestly up to her pledge to sever herself from the Church, she cannot inculcate one religion to the exclusion of the others. On the other hand, it is an Atheistic outrage on the Christians, who compose the larger part of the citizens, to intrude between them and their children, and then give them a godless, which, as we have shown, must be an ungodly education. We have again and again warned the advocates of the Yankee State theory, that the entanglement was insoluble, and that the practical result will surely be, that the attitude of our constitutions will enable the infidel party to triumph everywhere, to expel the Bible and Christianity from all the schools, and to rear us (so far as State schools go) a generation of Atheists. This is to be the practical issue of their misguided zeal—the issue which is, in fact, rapidly establishing itself in the Northwest to-day. Now, all this difficulty was avoided by our fathers' plan. The State, which knows no church in preference to another, did not create schools; did not usurp that parental function; did not elect the teachers; did not ordain their discipline or religious character. Parents have the right to do all these things in the lights of their own consciences and spiritual liberty, and the parents made the schools. No other solution will ever be found that is as good.

R. L. DABNEY.

## LECTURE <sup>1</sup>

---

### COMMENDATION OF THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY.

---

It is now fashionable with many advocates of physical science, to denounce this study as useless. The subject to-night will be the inquiry, Is this so? Or is it still true, that "the proper study of mankind is man?" But we must define what we discuss. There is a tradition that the old Greek philosopher, Pythagoras, when asked, *Σοφιστής εἶ;* replied *Οὐ μὲν, σοφίας δὲ φίλος.* "Wisdom" here meant, knowledge of the mental principles which regulate all other knowledge. It was, I believe, H. Crabb. Robinson, who asked *Goethe* if he was reading any philosophy; when he said: "No; I do not propose at this time, to do any thinking about thinking." This is a very good definition of philosophic thought. *Thinking how the mind rightly thinks.* It is usually regarded as including, 1. Psychology, or the "natural history" of the human mind. 2. Logic. 3. Ethics, or the principles of *duty* 4. Ontology, or the science of real existences. 5. Nat. Theology: The inquiry after the First Causes.

The grounds on which philosophy is usually disparaged are these: First. That there can be no true science, except it be founded throughout on a basis of *facts*. How do we ascertain facts? By actual *observation*. The instruments of observation are our *senses*. But mind and its processes are not observable by our senses. Hence, second. There can be no true science, save of *phenomena* (changes in objects cognizable by our senses) and *their laws*. Third. The history of philosophy confirms this: they say, it has never had any certainty. It settles nothing, but keeps its doctrines in endless debate. Every new age presents a new philosophy, which is built up only to be demolished by the next age; whereas physical science is settled; it is "positive," it establishes its permanent laws, which thence-

forward abide to bless and help mankind with their applications. A striking instance of this charge is presented by Mr. G. H. Lewes, who writes a "History of Philosophy" with the purpose, as he says, of proving that there is no philosophy. This strikes me very much as though a man should trouble himself to write a biography of Wm. Tell, for the purpose of proving there had never been any Tell! Mr. Lewes thinks philosophy a humbug. The man who writes a whole history of a humbug is in great danger of making his book a humbug!

Men are arguing here, under this illusion, that it is the bodily senses alone which give *palpable, solid facts*; beguiled by that feature of obtrusiveness and familiarity, which marks our bodily sensations. Hence their baseless notion, that all doctrines about *Mind*, that intangible and invisible thing, are but vague speculations of which there is no stable way to convince other men. But the science of mind *is* a science of observation, and is based on facts, the most solid kind of *bottom-facts: The facts of consciousness*. "Ah," they reply; "of consciousness! Another shadowy, abstraction among faculties! Give us facts of eyesight!" Very well. Let us take the most familiar and homely case. Your eyes, nose and palate, you think authorize you solidly to say: "I see my breakfast." But in saying that, you have said, I, Ego, Self! And the *ego*, the self, has been the subject of your proposition, the nominative to your verb "*see*." So that to know your breakfast, you must first have known yourself, as a Mind capable of consciousness and thought, believing in its own existence and identity, and furnishing from its own inner powers the conception of *space*, position, and the other relations in which the breakfast is seen to exist. You must have a knowledge of this *Self* in order to have a knowledge of your breakfast. You can only believe in your breakfast by means of believing in this self, this mind, and its laws, which shows you the outer object. If your belief in your mind is not solid, still less can the belief in your breakfast be. this hangs on that. What a delusion then, to say that your breakfast is a fact of observation, and yet, 1 its laws and powers, 2 your 3 mind, are not! While shut up in this room, you could fast is a fact of observation, and yet, (1) its laws and powers, (2) your, (3) mind, are not! While shut up in this room, you



could only see one of those trees, *by looking through a window*. And the window is nearer to you than the tree. So that you cannot know the tree as a fact of observation, *without having first known the window as a fact of observation*. So, you can never reason, without having, beforehand, and in order to your reasoning, some *principle or axiom, which you reason by*. Try it. You reason, for instance: "Men must be real free agents, *because* a just God holds them responsible." Right. But your mind saw this inference to be right, only because you were guided by this prior, self-evident principle that free agency is necessary to my just responsibility. If your inference is solid, the principle it hangs on must be more solid. But that is an abstract principle in philosophy! And when you argue with your fellow man, you know that you can only convince him of your inference, by means of that same first principle regulating his mind and thought, just as it does yours. If you did not think so, you would deem it just as sensible to argue with your horse, as your neighbor. And so, all around, we find that our "facts" of sensation are only certain to our knowledge on condition we believe in these inner "*facts*" of mind, the general and, if you will, abstract *principles of thought*, which regulate the action of all faculties, from the olfactory, up to conscience. You have had to philosophize, in spite of yourself, in order to use your nose, your fingers, and your eyes and ears. You may be in the condition of astonishment of Moliere's *gentilhomme bourgeois*, M. Jourdain, who, when his literary teacher showed him the distinction of prose and verse, was very much surprised to find that he had been speaking prose all his life! You have been obliged to proceed, in all your knowledge, on this much abused philosophy, all along!

It may be well just here to illustrate farther the fact that every man philosophizes, "will he, nill he," if he thinks. Here is a plain carpenter, who on Monday takes up the hatchet he had sharpened and used Saturday. It proved itself of good steel, temper and edge, then. Will it cut well this morning? Assuredly it will, says the honest man. But may it not have changed its nature since Saturday, although not meddled with in any way? Is it obliged to be steel now, because it was steel then; may it not now be of soft iron? or lead? "No!" he exclaims. "That's absurd!" But why absurd, Mr. Carpenter?

Perhaps he had not thought it out in full form; but now that you press him to do so, he tells you: no change could have been made in the metal without *some cause*; and that "he knows by looking at it," i. e., by its sensible properties, that it is still steel. That is all very plain and simple; but this carpenter has now posited three of the most profound general truths of abstract philosophy: The necessary law of causation; the continuity and permanency of substantive being; and the inseparable union of attributes to their substance. He has been dealing in the depths of ontology! He has even decided the philosophic axiom on which the theological argument for and against the sacrament of the mass turns! Quite a philosopher he!

A pump-maker brings you a new pump. He knows that the piston, valves and air-tight joints are precisely like those of other pumps in actual use. You ask, "Has this pump ever been tried?" "No, sir." "Then how do you know it will draw any water?" "Oh, sir, it will be sure to draw. My other pumps made like it, do." Here he posits another prime maxim of philosophy: "Like causes are sure to produce like effects."

Messrs. Huxley, Comte, Tindal & Co. abuse philosophy, and applaud science. I ask them, can a *science* be built up by hypotheses alone? Oh, no! But why not? Why is inductive demonstration necessary? The answer is philosophy: logic. Does the frequent observation of a "*post hoc*" prove a "*propter hoc*?" Oh, no: that is not valid induction. Why not? The answer, again, is philosophy: logic.

Now, one may exclaim in surprise: How is it that we have all been philosophers unconsciously, and have spoken ill of the philosophy we all nevertheless employ? The answer is, that the fundamental laws of thought are *self-executive*. The kind Creator has, fortunately for us, ordained them so that they usually put themselves in operation and work aright, without our adverting to them, or choosing how they are to work. Then, you may ask: Is not the study of them as unnecessary as their action is unavoidable? I reply: the case is much like that of the muscles and tendons in a healthy boy's limbs. He does not know their names, number, or position; but none the less kind nature makes them obey his will; and he makes as good a run at football, as the best anatomist. The study of anatomy is

then useless? No: suppose the time comes when that boy has to amputate your limb! Anatomy will be very desirable for him then. And it will be a very good thing for him now; to teach him prudence in using that neat pair of legs of his, that he may not strain them the wrong way—or put a force on them they were not made for.

To the objection that philosophy is ever changing and unsettled, and has established no fixed principles of science, I reply by a denial. Philosophy has established a good many principles,—such as those named above. The most discordant schools teach them: the only difference between them has been as to the methods of establishing them. There have been many differing schools, rational, empeirical, ideal, pantheistic, spiritualistic, materialistic: from the Academy of Plato down to the “Concord school”: from Pythagoras to Hegel. But there have always been parts of philosophy, which have remained fixed. Since Aristotle wrote his *Analytics*, no philosopher has successfully disputed the main doctrine of the syllogism. With the great mass of philosophers the natural theology of Zenophon’s *Mem.* has continued to this day, the true, natural theology. Even in the most litigated branch of philosophic psychology, the orthodox school have always taught a doctrine substantially orthodox, *and the same doctrine*: Augustine, Aquinas, Anselm in the middle ages. If Locke, after Hobbes, taught a scheme conceding too much to sensation, Shaftesbury and Stillingfleet in England, and Leibnitz in Germany, refuted him, and taught the correct scheme. Over against Cordillac, the sensationalist, stood Roger Collard. Against Hume stood Dr. Thomas Reid: against the Mills, James and J. S. stood Hamilton.

Were we inclined to retort, we might ask, whether all the parts of professed physical science are stable and undisputed? Are there no mutations and debates there? Even the science of optics, newly created by Newton almost two centuries ago, is still uncertain whether her undulatory theory is true or not. Geology, though a science of the rocks, still fluctuates in many places like an unsteady sea. Its British Corypheus, Sir Charles Lyell, is said to have edited eleven editions of his own masterpiece, his “*Principles of Geology*”; and in every edition to have amended and contradicted something in the previous one. Men

differ by hundreds of thousands of years about their glacial age. Its stratigraphy is in some parts conjectural. The science of medicine, in many of its parts, is so uncertain and variable, as to provoke the gibe, that the doctors change as much in their fashions as the ladies do about their bonnets. In philology, two theories of the origin of language still contend for the mastery. Astronomers are not yet certain whether the nebular hypothesis is the true account of the origin of worlds, or whether the new star in Andromeda has not exploded it into a fiction even thinner than nebular "star-dust." Chemistry still has its doubts and its revolutions. Has it found out all the simple substances? Or has it counted too many of them? Has Kepule convinced all the chemists yet of his theory of insomorphie compounds? These questions remind us, that uncertainty and change are the traits of other sciences besides the philosophic.

It is often asked, tauntingly, what practical results has philosophy yielded for man? Look what physical science has done to ameliorate man's existence, to improve his means of subsistence, to palliate his diseases! It has taught mankind to subjugate nature, to utilize the lightning, to bridge mighty floods, to navigate the trackless oceans. Since the days of Lord Bacon, and under his guidance, physical science has almost made mankind a new race, in a new and better world. But what *practical results* does philosophy show? We will tell you anon, how she rendered an essential aid in all these material exploits. But we wish, as we pass along, to expose another large hallucination just here. First, education has two results: one, the communication of knowledge of facts; the other, the cultivation of the faculties and moral character. Of these, the latter is far the more valuable. Even on the lowest utilitarian view, it is better to have that culture, which enables the mind rapidly to gather the facts it may find useful, than to have, by borrowing, a set of facts without the ability to get more. It is better to have a well built mill, which can grind endless quantities of flour as needed, than to have numerous barrels of flour, with no machinery to grind more when needed. But farther: knowledge is valuable as a means; the man himself is the end. Hence, the culture which ennobles and makes the student more a man, bears most directly on the true

end. But the study of philosophy, even if it left no knowledge of useful facts, would still be the most valuable; because it conduces so powerfully to cultivate the soul, to sharpen the discrimination, and train the reason.

The Germans very happily call the "practical" branches, "the bread and butter sciences." They win the material means of living and luxury. This commercial age exalts them for that reason; but under an illusion. No one will dispute this truth, that these material luxuries are *means, not ends*. They are not valued in themselves, as we value the friend we love, but because their consumption ministers to us some pleasure. The epicure values his luxurious dish of fresh oysters, not as oysters—as such they ferment and decay—but as representing so many pulses of pleasure in his own consciousness, to be derived from their consumption. All these things are only *means* of happiness. Where is happiness: in the oysters, or *in the soul*? And what is happiness? The beast would have a simple answer: In eating and lying down to chew the cud. But he who would not degrade himself to a brute-level, must give the higher answer of philosophy: "Happiness is virtuous energy." Happiness is the right, harmonious and successful exercise of man's powers. And the higher the powers exercised, the higher the happiness. The nobler mental activities, then, are as much more valuable than material good, as the end is more valuable than the means. Those activities, those studies *are happiness*: the material goods are but means to happiness, uncertain, partial means; and the sciences called practical, if valued only for their "bread and butter" results, only means to those means.

As was mentioned, those who laud the physical sciences as the only studies worthy of pursuit, date their splendid career from Bacon. It began, they say, by his teaching us how to investigate material nature. But I ask, *was it a physical science* which taught that? By no means. It was philosophy! *Ba-* which taught that? By no means. It was philosophy. Bacon's *Novum Organum* is solely and purely a discussion of a metaphysical subject: What is inductive proof? the highest and most abstruse branch of logic. There is not a physical problem discussed or settled in the whole book, except one: "What is the nature of caloric?" And that is introduced solely to

illustrate the application of the metaphysical principle to physical inquiry. This, then, is an illustrious instance of the truth that, while the physical sciences are the handmaids of man's material welfare, they have to look to philosophy to show them how to proceed for this end. Take this parable. Let us suppose that building houses was truly "the chief end of man," instead of a mere means for his comfort. Then the carpenter would be the true hero. And his tools would be his noble weapons. But without the *dull whetstone*: these tools would cease to cut and shape the lumber! It is then as essential as any tool. Thus, philosophy may at least say, in the words of Horace: *Ergo fungar vice cotis, acutum Reddere quae femine valet exsors ipsa secandi.*

Nothing can more strongly illustrate the dependence of all other spheres of thought on philosophy for guidance than this question touching the conditions of scientific belief. Will you believe what you cannot understand? Should any amount of evidence make you do so? Sound physical science, like sound philosophy, answers: Yes. Mystery, even when incomprehensible, is no sufficient evidence a statement may not be true. There is no department of truths, not even the most familiar, that does not include, or at least imply, incomprehensible propositions. Will you believe what contradicts a necessary judgment of the mind, and fundamental law of thought? No. There is no amount of evidence sufficient to make you do that. For, you would argue, in doing that, you would so infringe the very conditions of rational belief as to leave the mind incompetent for any act of judgment. I cannot surrender these necessary laws of thought, in order to believe the statement which contradicts them, for if I did I should thereby become incapable of valid thought, and so, of rational belief. My assent to truth would be as valueless as that of the pig grunting his assent to a mathematical theorem. The derationalized being cannot believe.

But now, your assent to these two questions has made it most imperative for you to be prepared with an answer to another question: *Which are* the fundamental laws of thought? If the very condition of credibility of the statements offered you, the very possibility of believing them, is conditioned on their not contradicting those vital rules, you must be able *to*

*say which those rules are.* But this question takes you into the very heart of philosophy. To settle what are the truly fundamental and necessary laws of thought. To distinguish them by sure traits from other judgments, which habit, imitation or prejudice may have made us regard, though unwarrantably, as very essential truths; this requires the most thorough exploration of consciousness, and the most careful speculation. Is *this* a necessary and fundamental judgment: That the same finite thing cannot be at the same time in two places? Or this: That a material substance cannot change while all its sensible properties continue the same? Or the logical laws of identity, contradiction and excluded middle? Or, the law of causation: that no new effect can arise without adequate cause, and that like causes must always produce like effects? If these are necessary principles of thought, you may reject any amount of professed evidence for a contrary statement, assuring yourselves that "there must be some mistake." If you confound some dictate of habit or prejudice with these, you may be fighting against the truth. And, in fact, the history of opinion is full of just such confusions. And nothing but a very deep philosophy can unravel them!

Once more: Sir Wm. Hamilton very justly asserts, that philosophy is necessary—at least to all who do not believe the Bible, to know whether there is a God. Certainly He is not audible, visible, or tangible; so that the question cannot be settled by observation with our senses. We see very clearly that most of the things in this world are temporal and dependent beings; as the plants, the trees, the animals, the humans. Go back in time far enough and we reach the date when they were not. We cannot think they created themselves. Is it then a necessary law of thought, that we must reason back from the dependent, to some independent Being; from the temporal to the eternal? And if yes: Is this eternal Being self-existent? Is he living; or as Mr. H. Spencer says: is it not a He, but an It, an eternal, blind, physical *force*? Is He or It intelligent? Is He a free agent? Has He a moral character, and is that character bad or good? All these are questions of philosophy! But they are the most practical questions in the universe. Can there be any prayer, or not? Is there any providence? Is there any hereafter? Is my dead child annihilated? And will I be re-

sponsible in that hereafter for my conduct here? Can I enjoy any religious hope, or must I be an atheist, "without God, and without hope in the world?"

The disparagers of philosophy are fond of saying, that the exact sciences give them solid footing on the earth; but philosophy is a changing and fickle "cloudland." Let us accept the similitude for a moment. We are then reminded that it is from this cloud-land the most beneficent, and the most destructive agencies descend, which bless or devastate the habitations of men. From those shifting clouds falls the gentle rain, which waters the earth and makes it bring forth "bread for the eater and seed for the sower." Thence also descends the tornado, which wrecks the costliest works of man, and crushes him a mangled worm under their fragments. Thence leaps down the thunderbolt, which shivers his towers and scorches him with instant death.

Philosophy is the cloud-land? So be it. This metaphor then reminds us of the great practical truth: That it is *opinion*, which really rules the world, for weal or woe. And these governing opinions, which when popularized, become the most practical guides of action, and the most tangible and concrete blessings or curses of mankind, have their *source* in the abstract regions of philosophy. The thinker finds them there, rightfully or wrongfully, and impelled by their logic becomes their apostle, and in turn impels the reasons of the multitude to deeds of heavenly beneficence or of relentless cruelty. You have all heard of the religious persecutions of the middle ages. Let me raise before you the picture of one scene, typical of a thousand others as ghastly. It is about A. D. 1210. His holiness, Innocent III., Pope of Rome, has proclaimed a crusade against the peaceful Albigenses in the South of France, and promised valuable "indulgences" to all who will assist to destroy them. The city of *Bezieses* in Languedoc is crowded with these hapless people, who have at last stood at bay for their lives, with their wives and children, intermingled with a multitude of devout Roman Catholics. Seventy thousand souls throng the beleaguered town; when breaches are made and the fierce soldiery, inflamed almost to phrensy by the desperate resistance, are ordered to enter and put every soul to the sword. The Bishop *Arnauld Amaieu*, is there as representative of the



Pope, to guide and bless their efforts in the name of the "Prince of Peace." Even the executioners asked, by what sign they should distinguish heretic from good Catholic, so as to spare the latter. "Kill them all," cried his holiness. "The Lord will know his own!" And all: helpless babes, pious Catholics, as well as dissenting Albigenes, perished in one remorseless slaughter.

But these butchers supposed that they were only acting out their philosophy consistently. Is man responsible for his beliefs on moral subjects, or not? This is a question of moral philosophy. If he is, then ought this wrong believer (*mescreant*) to be punished for his error? Why not? It is wrong. It is a responsible wrong. It is a most mischievous wrong. The heretic may do more hurt to human welfare, especially when the eternal consequences of soul-destroying error are included, than all the horse thieves, burglars, and free-booters in the world. Why, then, should society hang the horse thieves, and allow to the heretics immunity? Is it not unequal, unfair, unjust? And since Rome teaches that her Popes are the God-appointed depositories of doctrinal infallibility, and guardians of Gospel truth, why should not the Pope direct the sword of justice? And why should we not deem the stern severity of the execution to be righteousness and not cruelty, as we do when the sheriff executes the grim sentence of the law on the felon, with almost infinite pity concealed in his heart, and yet under the impulse of an awful *duty*, which leaves him no option? Plant those propositions sincerely in the conviction of these persecutors' minds; and their bloody acts are the consistent result. Now, we Americans are blindly and passionately attached to liberty of thought and denounce the wickedness of persecution for opinion's sake. I propose to you to take that chain of propositions which I stated, and show the flaw in their connection. You find them apparently an iron chain. Where will you break it? at which link? Only philosophy can show you how to break it. If you reject her aid, you stand in an attitude more amiable, indeed, than the persecutor; but in which your amiability is a logical inconsistency.

Again: we have all heard the famous maxim: "All men are by nature *equal*." There are two species of equality. There is the equality of British freedom, whose watchword is: "Ev-

ery Englishman is equal before the law." It does not mean that the peasant is equal to the peer in the list of his particular franchises—these are very different. But the peasant has the same right to his narrower franchises as the peer has to his wider. The same law protects both, on the same fundamental principles of justice. The maxim, in this sense, does not assert that nature has made men literally equal in strength, in sex, in capacity of mind, in virtue, in fortitude, in health. Hence it holds that a true and equitable equality must distribute different grades of franchise to these different beings, according to their capacities to use them. It does not hold that the child justly wields the same set of privileges as the father. It does not believe that the woman has, for instance, the same "inalienable" right to sing bass and wear a beard with her husband. But this maxim, after leaving Providence to distribute to different classes of mankind the several allotments of privilege they have capacity to improve aright, claims for the protection of all the common sanction of justice and the golden rule.

Then, there is the equality of the Jacobin: a very different thing, which teaches that mechanical sameness of function, franchise and privilege, in each detail, is a right, "inalienable," "natural" and "self-evident." That whatever particular franchise is enjoyed by the highest citizen, must also be attainable by the lowest; or these sacred intuitions are outraged. The question between these is a *question in philosophy*: not a very easy one, if we may judge by the frequency with which thinking men confuse the two together. Let us see what practical fruits this confusion of two abstract theories has borne.

One crop of those fruits might have been seen in Paris a century ago. "The Reign of Terror" was established. The guillotine stood before the Thuilleries "*en permanence*." The gutters ran daily with blood. The prisons, filled by vile delators with thousands of the noblest and best, were emptied by the "Septembrigans," through wholesale massacre. To have *belonged to a privileged class* was the sufficient crime. To assert the privilege of any class, in church or state, was treason. This was the logical result of the philosophy.

We pass over to America in 1865, and we see the second harvest of death from this same philosophy. If the Jacobin

equality is that which intuition teaches to be "inalienable," then it was inconsistent that the Africans, though pagans, aliens, lately savage, and utterly unfit to wield the higher franchise of civic life without ruining society and themselves, should be "held to service or labor" under other citizens. It was iniquity that they should be denied any franchise attainable by any other citizen. As this was "self-evident," and the equality "inalienable," no constitutions, laws, or covenants could legitimate the difference between African and American. But they all became null and void in attempting to do so. Yea, God himself was quite roundly notified, that he had better not legitimate it, or he would be repudiated also! And when some eight millions were unable to see this Jacobin logic so, a quarter of a million of them were killed, their homes desolated, and half a continent clad in ruin! *Thus practical* is this science of philosophy!

Are these portentous forces of the philosophic cloud-land, then, reducible to no laws? If so, we must cower and tremble before them, as our savage forefathers, twenty centuries ago, did before the lightning and tempest. The conviction that their causes are beyond our control, or even knowledge, must combine with our experience of their mischiefs. Is this abject state the best that physical science can promise to society? No. As Matthew Maury reduced the laws of meteorology to a science, hitherto only a riddle and a terror to mankind, so a modest philosophy, pursuing the same humble, diligent method for "the investigation of nature," teaches to discriminate, to foretell, and even to control the lightnings descending from the spiritual world.

## THE LABOR UNION, THE STRIKE AND THE COMMUNE.

---

(Reproduced and enlarged from the "Texas Review" of 1891.)

---

Labor Unions have been very obtrusive phenomena in these latter years of the nineteenth century. In profession they are voluntary societies of working men for protecting the "rights of labor."

Were they only associations for protecting the lawful rights of laborers, no more political objection could lie against them than against Granger societies, social clubs, art unions, or Christian churches themselves. But their real and main design is far other. Their avowed purpose and practice are: First, to control the discipline which employers exercise over individual laborers, members of the union; and second, to coerce the payment of higher wages by employers to the laborers. Their weapon of coercion for both ends is, the strike. The labor union has its council and executive head, elected by the laborers from among themselves, and its union-fund raised by monthly or weekly contributions from their wages. Each member is bound by strict vow to obey this council and chief implicitly. Here is the working of the machine. Among the laborers of a certain mine or factory is A. B. "A union man" whom his employers find unpunctual, insolent, incompetent for his work, or drunken. The employers protect themselves by paying him off and discharging him: the only possible mode of self-protection left them under the hiring system of labor. But now the chiefs of the union interfere. They say A. B. is under the protection of "the union," therefore the employers shall retain him and pay him full wages, although they believe he does not suit them, does not earn half his wages and indeed is doing serious and permanent injury to the credit of the firm

by "scamping" his work. If the employers decline to submit, they are at once punished by a "strike." Under the orders of the union-chiefs every laborer is to leave his employment at the concerted signal; every wheel in the factory is to be stopped; all production is to be arrested, and the employer's whole investment reduced to a dead capital until such time as the union chiefs may see fit for ending the strike.

Meantime the laborers and their families, after eating up prior savings, draw a small pension from the "union fund," which provides them a scanty subsistence until such time as their punishment works submission in the hearts of their employers.

Or, if the issue between the union and the employers is the rate of wages, a similar strike is relied on to coerce the latter into paying such wages as the laborers think they should have. Such is the theory of the strike.

The moral and economic objections are patent and trite. The period of total idleness is often ruinous to the habits of the men. The system establishes the state of chronic social warfare between employers and employed, instead of that condition of kindly co-operation, which is so essential to happiness of feeling and prosperity in the business. The strike entails a fearful destruction of wealth. All profit on the plant of the employers is lost; while the savings of the laborers are eaten up, in unproductive consumption, and their time, which is their money, is wasted for naught. The community as a body is left just so much the poorer.

Upon this loss follows another sure economic result, which deserves to be more fully explicated. The law is this: Whenever any hindrance or constriction from any cause whatsoever, is applied to production, the practical hardships thereof are shifted over and delivered down by the better endowed members of the community, until they press upon that class owning no property except their labor, which forms the bottom *stratum*. If we compare those hardships to a load or weight laid upon the top of a wall, and the several strata of the community to the horizontal lines of stones, we shall have an exact illustration: the pressure of that load is ultimately delivered down upon the bottom stratum. This result is insured by a universal principle of human nature, the preference for one's

own welfare and the welfare of those he loves, over that of strangers. An individual instance will best prove this. We will suppose the head of a family a stockholder in the manufactory which is undergoing a strike. He is not one whit more selfish or less charitable than any other rich man, or laboring man. The dividends on his stock constitute his family revenue. By reason of the strike those dividends will drop this year from \$2,500 to \$1,800. He and his wife hold a council upon the question, What is to be done? They are prudent people, who do not wish to go in debt. What will they do? Just what all other parents in the world would do, viz: They will so change their expenditures as to live on the \$1,800, while imposing upon themselves and the children they love the lightest possible hardships of retrenchment and retaining as many of the solid comforts of life as possible. Their retrenchments will work after this fashion. Mother will say: "Husband, hitherto we have indulged our girls by having their finer raiment made up by a dressmaker. The girls must learn, with my help, to be their own mantua-makers; they have leisure enough." Father adds: "Our eldest, Emily, is now quite proficient in her music. Why can she not give the piano lessons to the younger girls, so as to save the heavy cost of the music teacher?" "Just so," says the mother: "And we can also dispense with one of the maids; for the girls can very well do the sweeping and dusting of the chambers; the exercise will be good for their health." "And," adds the father, "there is our boy, Tom, who is now a great, strapping fellow, passionately fond of horses. Why cannot Tom groom and harness old Baldy before and after his school hours, so we can dispense with a hired groom?"

So this family adjust themselves to the reduced income, without any real loss of comfort, only, they have to be somewhat more busy and have less time for idling and loafing, which is all the better for their health and cheerfulness, but, "How does this retrenchment work? Upon the under *stratum*." This dressmaker, who thus loses the custom of a large family is Miss Bettie Jones, the daughter of a poor and sickly old widow, whom she must support along with herself, by her needle. On her this retrenchment presses as a real and probably a cruel hardship, but who can blame this gentleman and his wife for their prudent and honest measures? Surely, it would be still

more cruel in them to continue employing Betsy Jones' needle and then fail to pay her. So the professional music teacher who loses three pupils (a fifth or fourth part of her income), is Miss Lucy Hill, a poor but refined woman, who has to support herself and a paralytic father by her music fees. The discharged house-maid is Biddy Malony, the daughter of Mike Malony, and one of a family of eleven; and the father is the discharged groom, who had earned one-third of the bread and potatoes for his family by caring for old Baldy and his stable. Biddy's wages are now gone and she comes back upon her father to be fed, while half of his means for buying food are gone. Here are four deserving poor persons who are hit hard as a consequence of this decline in the stockholder's income. But it is the strikers who are really responsible for these cruel blows.

I have given a particular instance which is thoroughly typical. Other cases will vary endlessly in details; but they will all work under the same principle. In every case where injury or constriction is planned against the resources of the property class the injury designed for them will be mainly evaded and handed down, until it alights upon the bottom class beneath them. Here we have a biting illustration of the folly (a folly equal to its dishonesty) of all the hostilities of "labor against capital." Every blow which the working men are instigated to aim at their employers must prove a boomerang.

Next, we find this attempt to coerce employers by strikes, as futile as mischievous. The pretensions of the labor union must appear to the employers unjust, usurping and even insolent: it surely provokes resistance. But in the contest thus begun the employers have every advantage. They have more means saved up upon which to live; the arrest of production means for them only the retrenchments we have described above; while for the laborers it means destitution and hunger. So the employers hold out longest, and the union men have to submit after all this bootless loss.

But a stronger element of defeat appears. The labor union does not include all the poor men of the vicinage. Many of these need employment badly and are only too glad to accept the wages and the employment which the union men have just disdained and rejected. Thus after a few days' suspension the wheels of the factory begin to revolve again with a new body

of laborers, while the union men find themselves left out in the cold permanently.

Thus the strike system has proved an utter futility, and worse, unless the union men proceed to further measures, which pass at once into criminality. These are always violent and illegal attempts to prevent non-union men from accepting employment, by insults, threats, blows, assaults, and even murders. The union resolves that their late employers shall not exercise their reasonable and lawful rights to form such new contracts of labor as they and the new employes see fit to approve; they decree that their fellow citizens, their lawful equals, while not union men, shall not exercise the inalienable right of every free human being to work for a living, and to make such contract concerning employment and wages as is satisfactory to himself. Thus the union men "picket" the gates of the factory. They denounce the new laborers as "scabs," as traitors to the cause of the working-man. They make violent threats. In extreme cases they proceed to violent assaults, to murder, to arson, to assassination. Thus the labor union is transmitted into a criminal conspiracy. Every intelligent and just mind views these ulterior measures as most outrageous wickedness and despotism wrought under the pretense of defending the rights of the working men. Yet without these outrages their system effects nothing but direct injury to themselves, as to all concerned. Obviously, the concession to their demands means the confiscation of the employers' property, overthrow of law, the raising of an aristocracy of rights in the union men as against their non-union equals and fellow citizens, and the enthronement of the union in the room of the lawful commonwealth, as an absolute commune.

The true logic of the strike system is this: It is a forcible attempt to invade and dominate the legitimate influence of the universal economic law of supply and demand. This law instructs us that generally the relation of supply to demand in any commodity must regulate its price. Under this law all production must proceed in civilized society. It is under this law the capitalist must produce and market the goods brought forth by his mine or his factory. It is under this law the farmer and planter must rear and sell their crops. Labor is also a commodity as truly as wheat, or cotton, or cloth. All though citizens



whose circumstances prevent the successful formation of labor unions must also contract to sell their labor under the dominion of this same law of demand. If the supply offered in the market exceeds the demand, the price must go down: the general law is inexorable: the producers of that commodity must submit to receive less for what they have to sell, and so content themselves with smaller profits; or they must find means to produce their commodity more cheaply. Particular circumstances may in some cases suspend the working of this law partially and temporarily. But as a general law it is as prevalent and regular as the law of gravitation in physics. The advocates of labor unions do not pretend to deny—they expressly avow—that the purpose and end of their system is to contravene this law as to the commodity which they have to sell, that is a particular form of labor. They perceive that the labor union and the strike are expedients from which the great majority of their fellow citizens are utterly precluded by the nature of their occupations, and *that is the very reason why the unionists value these expedients*. They know perfectly, that if all the other forms of labor in the commonwealth found it equally feasible to protect their own occupations from the law of supply and demand by their own labor unions and strikes, the whole system would be nugatory. For instance, what the spinners in a factory gained by forcing up their wages, would be neutralized by what they would lose to the farmers when they came to buy their food; if the farmers also could have a labor union which would force up the price of their crops proportionately and equitably.

From this point of view the thoughtful reader sees, that labor unions are rather conspiracies against fellow citizens and fellow laborers, than against oppressive employers. We observe that these societies thrive chiefly among operatives in mines and factories, among classes of artisans in towns, among printers, among the employes of railroad lines, or of wharves or shipping. This is because circumstances peculiar to their occupations render their measures feasible and convenient. Either they live in the same village or they can easily meet; there is a uniformity in each industry; their compensation is immediately in money-wages for labor. But let us observe how numerous and vast classes of meritorious laborers are entirely

prevented from combining successfully to force their wages up by strikes. The maid-servants and cooks of America, the hundreds and thousands of school-ma'ams who teach the children of the country for pauper wages, the millions of hired farm laborers, the more numerous millions of yeoman farmers who till their little farm with their own hands, the still larger millions of toiling mothers and housewives are precluded from forming any effective labor unions by their dispersion over a vast continent, their diversities of condition, their varieties of products, and indirect mode in which they receive their final compensation; modes involved in commercial complications where the law of supply and demand must inevitably rule. Here appear at once the real purpose and the iniquity of our existing system of labor unions. C. D. is a weaver in a cloth factory. Mr. E. F. is an honest farmer who must buy a good deal of this cloth to clothe his family and himself. One element of the cost of the cloth to E. F. is the wage of C. D., the weaver; but C. D. has resolved that E. F., his fellow citizen and equal, shall not buy that element in the value of the cloth at that equitable rate which should be generally dictated by the law of supply and demand: C. D. will force up that price against that farmer by the artificial forces of his monopoly-ring, his threats and his strikes. But C. D. fully expects to buy the bread and meat for his family from the farmer, E. F., under the strict operation of supply and demand. There is equity and democratic equality with a vengeance! But should any law or labor union enable the farmer to enhance the price of his food-products above market rates as determined by supply and demand, C. D. would declare himself much outraged. His labor union is a good rule for him; but it must not "work both ways."

I have now brought the reader to a point of view from which the justice of three practical remarks will be self-evident. When labor unionists denounce the great "trusts" of the capitalists, the oil, or sugar trust, as monopolies, we have a curious instance of inconsistency and insolence. What are their societies but labor-monopolies? In every essential feature they are the iniquities which the trusts are, only upon a smaller scale. And when political demagogues adopt the cause of these labor unions, to cater for their votes, under the pretense of democracy, they are doing the most anti-democratic thing possi-

ble. Their cry is: "For the masses against the classes!" Yet they are assisting a narrow class to plunder the masses of their fellow citizens.

The second thing to be noted is, the groundless and impudent claim of these labor unions that they are contending for the "rights of American labor." This tacitly assumes that the small minority of persons who belong to labor unions are the only people in America who labor. I may digress for a moment to add, that the same insolent falsehood is obtruded whenever the tariff system claims to be protective of American labor: as though, forsooth, the factory hands working upon protected manufactures were the only people who perform deserving labor! Whereas it has been perfectly proved a hundred times that this class of laboring men are but a few hundreds of thousands among the millions who labor in America; that they were already better paid than the average of their brethren; and that this "protection" is but a legalized method to enable them to take something from the unprotected earnings of their fellow citizens without value received, and to add it to their own. To return: there are a few hundreds of thousands of labor unionists in the United States. The census of 1890 shows that at most there may be four millions of persons engaged in occupations whose conditions render a labor union possible, but there are seven and a half millions engaged in the heavier labor of agriculture, under hotter suns and freezing winds, to whom the arts of the labor union are impossible. They must produce and sell their crops under the inexorable operation of the law of supply and demand. And if over supply or partial legislation reduces the price of their products below the cost of production, these millions must simply endure it. Methinks if there could be any honest labor union to "protect the rights of American labor," it should be one which would lift the wages of these tillers of the soil nearer the level enjoyed by the unionists.

The average American yeoman earns about fifty cents per diem with coarse fare by his heavy toil; if we deduct from the price of his farm products a moderate interest upon the capital which he employs, and all the other elements of the cost of production, except the manual labor. In the neighboring town, the unionist bricklayer or plasterer scorns to lift his trowel for

less than five dollars per day. There are a thousand farm laborers to one bricklayer. Yet this one tells us that his conspiracy is for the protection of labor! And what shall we say of the myriads of rural artisans who cannot form labor unions; of the hundreds of thousands of poor teachers and school-ma'ams whose wages are twenty-five dollars per month without boarding, for four or five months of the year? And what of the twelve millions of mothers and housewives who labor for their food and clothing in the most wearying of all tasks, year in and year out, not under an eight hour rule, you may be sure! but somewhere between twelve and eighteen and even twenty hours out of the twenty-four? Are all these not laborers because they cannot be "knights of labor?" Yet the direct effect of the arts of the labor unions is: to raise the price of every roof which shelters, of every chimney and every pound of coal which warms, and of every yard of cloth which covers these worse paid laborers in favor of a small minority already overpaid in comparison.

I am not oblivious of the plea that skilled labor is entitled to higher remuneration. The assumption is that all the forms of labor of the unions are skilled labor; while the toils of these ill-paid masses are unskilled labor. This is exactly false. For instance the effective farm laborer is far more a skilled workman than the bricklayer. The latter has one dexterity which is quite admirable: he strews a handful of mortar from his trowel more quickly, and he presses down brick after brick with its face to the line, more deftly than the plowman could. Very true. But that plowman must be able to do with equal deftness a dozen different things neither of which the bricklayer can do, and in attempting several of which he would be likely to wound himself or break his own neck. This farm laborer must be a horse breaker, must know how to guide the plow, to wield the hoe so as to "cut away the spire of crab grass" within half an inch of the tender cotton stalk without scratching it. He must wield the ax, he must be a rough carpenter; he must be butcher, knowing how to dress a mutton or a swine; he must milk the cow; he must mount the dangerous mowing machine and guide it; he must manage the complicated threshing machine and gin; he must pick two hundred and fifty pounds of seed cotton per day, where the bricklayer could not get one

hundred. It is the farmer who is the skilled laborer, and by that principle ought to receive the higher remuneration.

The third point being noted is, the fatuity of the so-called People's party in associating themselves with the labor unionists in their present passionate efforts to right the wrongs of the farmers. They are precisely as wise as would be the shepherd dogs who should insist upon enlisting the wolves along with themselves to guard the flock. The interests of the Granger masses and of the labor unionists are directly hostile. For instance, here is the yeoman farmer who is toiling to pay off a mortgage on his homestead at a real wage of about fifty cents per day (deducting fair compensation for the employment of his capital, teams, implements, etc.) Does he need a cottage, a chimney in it, a farm wagon, a thresher, a mower, a buggy plow, a rotary harrow?

The labor union men are compelling him to pay much higher prices for each of these things, by their conspiracies. For, of course, all these contractors and manufacturers add in the inflated prices of the unionist labor, in addition to their own profits, upon the cost of every thing they furnish the farmer. But these unionists are drawing from two and a half to five dollars per day for their work, while the farmer gets an half dollar per day for his work. He must sell everything his farm produces (the source out of which he at last gets his scanty earnings) under the resistless law of supply and demand, while they are so juggling with the arts of their conspiracy as to free themselves from that law. Yet we shall find this fatuous Granger enraged against the loan corporation which lent him good money on his own terms, at his earnest entreaty, and fraternizing with the knights of labor who are covertly skinning him!

The principles of the labor unions is virtual Communism. It is instructive to watch the proofs of this truth presented by the development of the union system in Great Britain. The British Liberals in 1845, represented by Joseph Hume and the famous Free Trade Society, announced the *laissez nous faire* free trade in commodities, and free trade in labor, as the very gospel of economics and politics. The first half of the doctrine repealed the protective tariff of Britain and placed her manufactures and commerce upon that enlightened basis of thorough

free trade, which founded the new era of marvelous progress and prosperity. The second half of the doctrine embodied the essence of the Exeter Hall at anti-slavery. Free trade in labor meant for Joseph Hume and his friends that every laborer should be a free man with the right to make his own contracts of labor to suit himself; but to make them, like the farmer, the manufacturer and the merchant, under the common regulation of the law of supply and demand. Obviously, equity demands that if the principle of free trade is to govern other commodities it must also govern labor. For labor is as truly a commodity to be bought and sold, as cloth, or wheat, or iron, or sugar. To enforce the production and sale of all the latter under the free law of supply and demand, while the other commodity, labor, is fenced against that law, is obvious class legislation and injustice to others. Hence, the Anti-Corn Law League hated tariffs and domestic slavery with a hatred equally intense and holy. It is true, that under this free trade *regime* the property and capital of Britain have made an enormous spring and doubled themselves in one generation. It is also true that under the same benignant regimen the labor of the *proletariat* gained greatly in its remuneration, and the comfort of its condition. Measured in gold, the average of their wages has advanced twenty per cent. since 1845; whilst the purchasing power of this increasing wage has been doubled by the results of free trade in commodities and in labor.

But these happy consequences do not at all satisfy the laboring men of Britain or the advanced Liberals. The former have generally adopted, with passion, the system of labor unions and strikes; the latter have pushed their theories through socialism to the verge of communism. Both the laborers and their theorists now reject with heat the dogma of free trade in labor. They declare that it is tyrannical, cruel, and the direct road to a wage slavery as degrading and detestable as African slavery itself. They assert the inherent right of the labor unions to enforce their demands for higher wages by violence if necessary, notwithstanding the facts, that this enforcement is a virtual confiscation of the personal property of the employers at the will of others, in the form of this increment of wage, that it is an infringement of the right of non-union men, their own free equals, to work for such terms as suit themselves; and that the

system organized a rebellious *imperium in imperio civilis*, usurping a part of its functions and forces. The socialists argue that since their strikes are utilities unless employers and non-union men can be prohibited by force from contracting with each other, these "scabs," thus accepting the places which the union men have rejected, make themselves the enemies of labor, and are therefore the proper objects of hostility and coercion. They say there is this essential difference between free trade in commodities (which they admit is all very well) and free trade in labor: that the goods bought and sold under free trade are non-sentient and feel no pangs of destitution; but the laborers have muscles and nerves to be worn by overwork, and stomachs to be pinched by hunger, and hearts to be wrung by the poverty of their families: therefore, the laborers ought to be entitled to protect their commodity, labor, against these consequences of free trade. This is, of course, a very shallow sophism, since the goods subjected to the rigorous law of supply and demand are imbued with the element of labor, since their sale is the only medium through which the labor involved in them can get its wage and thus the price of the goods touches the welfare of the laborers who produce them, just as effectively as the price of the labor itself. The socialists then adopt in substance, though perhaps not avowedly, the Malthusian principle of the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence. They argue thus; let the capitalists enjoy free trade in labor, hiring their operatives at whatever price the relation of supply and demand may dictate; then as the proletariat increases in numbers, wages will go down until they reach the lowest level of that wretched subsistence which enables the laborers only to exist, to be miserable, and to propagate heirs to their misery. Their cry now is, "Down with free trade in labor; up with the labor union, the strike, and the forcible coercion of the scab, the traitorous enemy of his class." Let the student see for instance this drift in the recent work of Mr. Benjamin Kid, entitled, "Social Evolution."

In this new phase and deduction of Malthusianism, there is unquestionable truth. It has been verified a hundred times in the depression, in the deficient compensation and misery of free laborers, in hireling commonwealths. Another admission must be made. No existing commonwealth organized exclusively

upon the hireling labor theory has yet found a full remedy for this deplorable tendency, no matter how liberal or even democratic its constitution. Sentimentalists may kick against a great Malthusian law, may call it antiquated, and may vilipend it; but none the less it remains a true and fundamental law of population. No permanent release from its inexorable operation is found in any economic or political expedient. When the means of subsistence increase in any society, population always tends to increase up to the new level. Then, if that new level of subsistence be not farther raised, population will proceed to press upon it and overpass it. The *proletariat* will accustom itself first to part with its luxuries, and then to submit to a scantier supply of comforts; and as long as their earnings are sufficient to support existence, this laboring class will continue to obey nature's instinct to increase and multiply. It is true that since the days of the Anti-Corn Law League, the wages and the comforts of the *proletariat* in Britain have increased handsomely under free trade. But the advanced Socialists insist that this improvement will stop, and will then ebb, as soon as certain other foreign and temporary agencies cease to operate. These are the wonderful expansion of British commerce (which yet cannot expand forever); the opening to tillage of new and vast food producing areas outside of Britain; the amazing improvements in both land and ocean transportation; the wide openings for emigration; the marvelous new applications of physical science to production; the unbroken prevalence of maritime peace over the whole area of British commerce. Behold how under these new and temporary agencies, the proletariat population of Britain has sprung forward, with an increase rivaling the mushroom growth of new American democracies, thus giving us another startling evidence of the truth of the Malthusian law. But all earthly expansions must stop somewhere. A colt may grow wonderfully when placed in a rich, fresh pasture; but after five years of age he must stop growing, no matter what his pasture. All earthly advancements must reach their limits. And the Socialists assert that when Britain reaches her limit the Malthusian principle combined with free trade in labor will at once begin to depress the laboring classes of Britain. And this must go on until they become miserable wage slaves



again, like the peasantry of France and Southern Europe before the Revolution; of the Ireland of 1840.

It is not necessary for me to say whether the whole of this socialist argument will prove correct. My purpose is to point the reader to the violent inconsistency into which it betrays them. They have ever been and still declare themselves the passionate enemies of domestic bondage. No language has been adequate to express their scorn and hatred for the recent social system of the Southern United States. No class of accusers have done more by false accusations, slanders, and vilification to bring upon that fair region an undeserved and remorseless deluge of revolution, war, devastation and tyranny, than these advanced socialists. But now, lo! we find them with equal passion asserting *a doctrine which leads directly back to a form of slavery far more ruthless than domestic bondage*. Every man of sense knows that when he is forbidden by force to work where he chooses, and for the wage which suits himself, even in a lawful occupation, is no longer a free man: he is a slave. The power which commands me where I shall not work is the same with the "slave-power" which commands another where he shall work. Again, when the labor union has forbidden me, a non-union man, to do the lawful work which suits me for the support of my family, I ask them: "To whom then must I look for the subsistence of those I love?" Their answer is: "*Join the union*, and draw your weekly pension from the community fund, which will be issued to you so long as it lasts, and you implicitly obey." Here again I am enslaved; far worse enslaved than the African bondman of the South; for while the labor union may issue to me, for a time, a pittance which may prevent starvation out of a scanty fund created only by a tribute taken out of my own previous wages, the Southern bondman drew all the time his full subsistence, whether the business of the commune was profitable or not. And to the giving of this livelihood the head of the commune was bound, if not by his own humanity, by public opinion, by statute-law, and by a self-interest more imperious than either. And to furnish this undiminished livelihood there was bound, not a scanty fund gathered by exactions from the laborers' wages, but the whole capital and profits of the head of that commune, including the returns of his own personal industry. But this is only

half the story. If the labor union, that is, the commune, is to have full authority to forbid its members to work, then it must make itself responsible for the full subsistence of the laborers and their families. But if the commune is responsible for this, it must have authority to command the members where they shall work and to enforce that command. Without this power the commune could not possibly fulfill its pledges to furnish subsistence to its subjects. But the essence of slavery is the obligation of compulsory labor, and the dependence upon the will of another for subsistence. *Communism is slavery.* Its advocates cheat themselves by explaining: "But the members elect their own rulers, and this is liberty." A very hollow cheat this, indeed! Let communism be established as a rule of a commonwealth, and this will be the real state of the case. In name the majority will elect masters over themselves, and the unwilling minority. But Democracy and universal suffrage have taught us too well what that means. Nominally the majority was really the official wire-pullers, will determine the choice of the masters over both majority and minority. Should this result not follow and should the communistic elections fulfill most honestly the most flattering promises of the system, still we should have this result: that the minority would be slaves to the majority. And the major mob is always the most ruthless of masters. Let us again make the vital point in this discussion thoroughly salient. The ultra socialist will attempt to obscure it by saying that in the best constituted republic the minority has to obey the majority; and this is not slavery for anybody, but liberty for all. I reply, that herein are two profound falsehoods. The first, that in a true republic the minority do not obey the majority, *but both obey the constitution.* The principle of such government is given by the sublime words of Andrew Melville *Lex Rex*: The citizen does not owe his allegiance to the mere will of the accidentally major mob, but to the sacred authority of the constitution which rules the State. The power which this constitution may have conferred upon a majority is only conventional, deputed and limited. The clearest majority may only exercise that power within the limits prescribed for it by the constitution, and when it exceeds these limits, the will of the majority is no more the righteous rule for the citizen than the howling wind. But the second and more essential

falsehood is here: The true republic does not legislate at all concerning the personal rights, the preferred occupations, the compensations therefor, or the subsistence of their families. All these matters belong to their individual sovereignty as citizens. The republic only attempts to regulate those outer relations of citizen to citizen, which render them social beings, under the principles of commutative justice. But the commune undertakes in addition to command me at what to work, to enforce its command, to fix my recompense, and to appoint the subsistence allotted to me and my family. This invades the whole sphere of my personal sovereignty. It is the essence of slavery. Moreover, all history teaches us, that the more "Paternalistic" any government becomes, be its form either imperial, monarchical, aristocratic or democratic, the more will its officials engross the powers of the State, and the earnings of the citizens to themselves. (The experience is universal), either by avowed class legislation or by unavowed chicanery, they always do it. The cause of this result is plain. The more paternalistic the government, the more of the aggregate wealth, services and rights of its citizens does it handle. That is to say, the more of these do the officials of this government handle. But such masses of wealth and power present to the natural greed of men temptations too strong to be resisted. Now of all governments the commune is most completely paternalistic. Therefore the officials of the commune, by which we mean the all-including commune of the local communes, the commonwealth, will have the handling of all the earnings, wealth, services, and subsistence of all the citizens. Therefore the engrossment of all these by the officials will be the most enormous. For instance, the township institutions of the Russians are communistic. The imperial government is an absolute commune. But the Emperor Nicholas himself, the most autocratic of Czars, declared that official peculation and tyranny were more gigantic in Russia than anywhere in Europe. Thus it appears that communism must be essential slavery, under which the citizens are the slaves, and the master is impersonal and therefore the most remorseless and greedy of all masters.

Now of all the things in the nineteenth century, Southern bondage was the one, which the advanced socialists most hotly abused. They condemned the Southern plantation as the sum

of all villainies. But this plantation was virtually the very commune which they desired to establish, except that the Southern had certain saving differences, which made it better than their proposed form. The capital of the plantation and the earnings and services of all upon it composed the common fund. The labor of the members was compulsory. But the common fund was bound to them for the subsistence of them and their families, fully as comfortable as that provided by the United States for their enlisted soldiers, including housing, fuel, clothing, food, medical attendance, rearing for their minor children and the pensioning of the old, when past active service. The net earnings of the active members, after subtracting the cost of their own subsistence, and a small interest upon the capital furnished them, went into the common fund, to meet the last two drafts. Here was a small but true commune. The head of the commune was not elected by the slave-members; but was hereditary; and this was a great gain, saving all concern upon the waste of time, money and morals, which always attends pretended elections in a paternalistic democracy. But the grand, saving feature in this Southern commune was that one which our socialist most abhors; the legal establishing in the head of the commune of a right of property in the involuntary labor of the members. Our opponents exclaim that this is the essence of slavery! I reply this is very true; but I have shown that their plan must vest in the commune itself (that is in its officeholders) the power of control over the involuntary labor of the members, and the disposal of their earnings, else the society must speedily be bankrupt, and starve its dependents. But this is giving the commune, that is the officeholders, property in this involuntary labor, except in this all important respect: that it failed to enlist any domestic feeling, or any self-interest of the heads in the welfare of members. In such an association what need the officeholders care if a laboring member dies, or if the infants of his family perish of destitution, he loses no property! He has just so many the fewer cares to worry him. For instance, when the crews of the patriot British fleet which conquered the Invincible Armada at Gravelines were decimated by the spoiled beer, which their commissaries furnished, what did these care? Their private profits upon their beer contracts were safe in their pockets. If many

soldiers of General Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, died in the hospitals, this was but so much to his advantage, for he could continue their names upon the pay rolls of the army, and quietly pocket their wages and allowances. The greater the suffering and mortality, the more his riches grew. When British paupers died in the work-house, under the late poor law system, who cared; what official, what tax-payer? The United States had a brief experience in this line, under its notorious Freedman's Bureau. We presume that when these wards of the nation dropped off, the average officeholder felt no emotion but relief. So now, when a hireling sickens or dies, his employer has lost nothing: he has but to hire another in his place. But our Southern communism, by making the labor the master's property, awoke an all-powerful motive for taking the best care of it.

If the laborer died, from over-work or destitution, so much of the master's property was totally lost; if he sickened, its value was impaired. Hence, the statute law, which required a master to provide reasonable subsistence under all conditions of production however profitless, for his bondmen, their aged and their offspring, and which made this provision a first lien, not only upon the annual products of the estate, but upon its fee simple value, and even upon his personal earnings in his separate profession, was an enforceable law; and it was always enforced, if not by affection and self-respect, by all-powerful self-interest. It was not like the rules of ultra-democratic societies, which speciously requiring all officers to use their powers for the public good alone, so commonly remain a dead letter. Hence, while a few masters were tyrannical and stingy, the bondmen in general had better food, clothing, housing, fuel, medical attendance, than any other peasantry in the world. While the employer of hireling labor pushing forward his railroad, his canal, his malarial farm, his mine, his chemical works, cares not whether the laborers lose wealth or life or not, the Southern master, in hiring his bondman to another, always made a part of the contract that he should not be employed in any unhealthy occupation.

The late Southern form of communism was therefore the only one defensible. The theory, combined with the other dogmas of the socialists, outrages every fundamental principle of

human nature and of human actions. It appeals to the prevalent principle of self-interest precisely in the wrong place, stimulating it powerfully in the officeholder's selfishness, neglect and malversation; while it loses its impulse in the work of production for the general behoof. This communism ignores man's desire for personal possessions, his right to an individual home, blest according to his own choice in the use of those possessions, his zeal for the welfare of his children, his right to bequeath to them the proceeds of his own labor. No system can endure, which thus discards the fundamental laws of nature. A structure built without a foundation must tumble. But the folly of ideologues and demagogues may persuade some discontented and misguided commonwealth to attempt the general commune. But it is impossible the attempt should continue. Its only permanent result will be destruction, or enormous mischief to the material civilization, morals and happiness of the society. The people disgusted with the experiment, will speedily struggle back to some political order, less insane; usually to one more despotic and less benignant than that which they deserted. Or else, communism will destroy their wealth and civilization and bring it down to chronic barbarism.

An authentic incident of one of the great "mining strikes" in Pennsylvania well illustrates this. A yeoman farmer was harvesting the products of his little orchards and fields, when a sturdy loafer demanded a bag of apples and potatoes, with the plea that he had neither money nor provisions for his family. "And who might you be?" asked the farmer. "A striking miner, out of work for many weeks, with the Reserve Fund of the Union utterly exhausted, and the strike unadjusted." "And," inquired the farmer, "why did you strike at first?" "Because the company," said the miner, with sundry indignant epithets, "refused to raise our daily wages from one and a half dollars to one and three-fourths." "So," said the honest farmer, "I earned my farm, working at one-half dollar per day, and you reject work at three times that price. None of my apples or potatoes are for such as you." The farmer was right. The acts of the oligarchics are aggravated in injustice by the fact that they were already better paid than the majority against whom they would enhance prices.

The system also carries intrinsic injustice to the capital-

ists in two ways: First, that it demands virtually the right of making both sides of the bargain in this contract of labor and wages. Each party is entitled to make his own side of the bargain; or if the offer made him from the other side does not suit him, to withdraw. There is no visible limit to the degree of this injustice. Strikers say they strike, because wages go below the limit of comfortable support. But what is a comfortable support for a working man? If the strikers are to decide, it may mean Havana cigars, canvass-back ducks and truffles, with *Chateau Margaux* wine. The system encourages limitless extravagance and waste; all at the expense of other people's capital and of the other parts of the working public; second, the capitalists in selling the products of their factories, have to submit to the great law of supply and demand. But the laborers, in selling their labor to the capitalists, insist on evading that law. There is no equity there.

As to the rights of public order and of other laborers, the system tends constantly and violently to pass from a method of mutual protection, into a criminal conspiracy. The sole object of a threatened strike is to compel employers to pay prices for labor in advance of these indicated by supply and demand. If the supply were not full, demand alone would raise the price of labor, and the strike would be superfluous. Now, the strikers, as free men, have an undoubted right to decline work and wages they think unfair. They may be very unwise in declining; but it is their right. And here their right ends. But if the policy stops there, the employers will naturally defend themselves from this coercion, by going into the labor market and hiring at the market price that substituted help which the full supply offers. Thus, if the strike stops where the lawful rights of the strikers end, it is inevitably futile. Of course then it will not stop there. They will go farther to violate the rights of others, who have an indefeasible right to take up any lawful work and wages they choose. Strikers will go to attack this right, by "boycotting," by obloquy, by threats, by terrorism, by violence, by murder. And when dynamite is introduced to punish with death innocent persons, happening to use the appliances of obnoxious employers, the crime is worthy only of devils. To sum up: If the equal rights of other laborers to accept the work and wages rejected are respected; strikes are futile. If

those rights are obstructed by force, strikes are criminal conspiracies. And our point is that the latter is their logical tendency. Unfortunately, the frequency of these outrages as the sequels of strikes, fully confirms the charge. In fine, only three modes are possible for adjusting the wages of labor and interest of capital. One is to leave the adjustment, under equitable laws, which shall hold laborer and property-holder equals, to the great law of supply and demand. The second is, to have the Government fix maximum and minimum prices by statute. The third is to leave these combination of laborers and employers against each other. For, if the one combine, of course the others will. The second plan is mischievous despotism. See its working in the French Revolutions. The third splits society into warring factions, and tends to barbarism.

Such is an impartial estimate of the tendencies of the "Trades Unions." The gravity of the prospect is increased; when we consider the passionate determination of their members. They seem more and more in love with their plans and cherish them as their final and complete hope. We are told that the movement spreads continually. It has its propagandists and newspapers. It confederates the different branches of mechanical labor more and more widely. It aspires to hold the balance of power in elections, and will before long, claim to control legislatures and congresses.

Will primary education be its antidote? The negative to this hope seems to be pronounced by the fact, that, thus far, these projects have grown just as primary education has extended, and precisely in the places which most rejoice in its means. The same discouragement follows from observing the species of development produced—an initial grade of knowledge and intelligence, just adequate to the suggestion of a number of unsatisfied desires, and the adoption of the shallow plausibilities of sophistical theories for their gratification; while the breadth of wisdom needed to show the hollowness of them has not been attained; and this dangerous Sciolism is aggravated by the self-sufficiency inspired by a conceit of culture. This primary education exactly prepares a population for the reading and acceptance of superficial newspapers. Without the circulation of newspapers, there would be no "Trades Unions" and no strikes of any moment. The primary school and the newspaper press



play into each others hands in assisting these dangerous organizations. In human hands all the best things are perverted to some mischievous uses, and here we have the perversions of these two good things, the School and the Press. The primary school enables the youth to read. Poor human nature usually craves the less wholesome pabulum for its powers, and here, the superficially cultivated reader uses his little talent to read the newspaper, instead of his Bible. The demagogue, the designing agitator sees at once in the newspaper an engine for swaying just such minds, and he makes one low, sophistical and shallow enough to suit his audience. Thus the country has its literature of "Strikes," Communism, Confiscation and Dynamite, with myriads of readers.

The more rapid progress of the late Confederate States, in the creation and accumulation of wealth, as demonstrated by the successive census returns of 1840, 1850 and 1860, was accounted for, in part, by the absence of strikes. The Negro laborers could not combine; the white found no motive to do so. Thus far the emancipated Negroes have not formed this species of Trades' Unions by the race lines. But the Southern people are now magnanimously giving them a universal common school education. The result will be, as sure as the cycle of the seasons, that before long they will also form their own "trades' unions" on the "color line." They will form them, because their partial culture will exactly prepare them for their sophisms and attractions; because they have already shown a marked tendency toward co-operative associations, and a passionate fondness for them; because, as now free laborers, they must feel the *stimuli* to that course, now almost omnipotently felt by white artisans among us. They will form them on the "color line," if for no other reason, because the whites have already applied that line everywhere in their trades' unions, and that with a passionate vigor.

One of the future problems and perils of the country is this race contest. Where the industrial centers have a million of Negroes, educated up to the use of the stump-speech, the radical newspaper and the revolver, closely organized in trades' unions, then the peace of the country will hang in constant suspense.

Two antidotes have been proposed for the poisons involved

in these unions. One is, the application of the co-operative plan, which has been so successfully applied in England in the work of "distribution," to the industries of *production*? In retail distribution, the Rochdale plan has, indeed, wrought wonders, at least in England. It is still to be seen whether the system can be made to work among Americans, with their eager and intense individuality.

But there appears, on reflection, a fatal difficulty when we attempt to apply it to industries of production. It proposes to identify the relations and interests of the employers and the laborers. It says, these shall be as truly stockholders in the joint concern, and capitalists, as those. But, unfortunately, the difference between employers and laborers, between the property-class and the property-less class, has arisen out of natural and acquired differences of personal attribute, for changing which the methods of co-operation are as weak as "the Pope's bull against the comet." In a country like this, where the laws are already equal, the whole difference between those who have property, and those who have not, has been made by the presence, or lack of "talents of acquisition" in themselves or their parents. The well-to-do families are so, because their working members have energy, skill, prudent foresight, self-denial as also, perhaps, selfishness. Especially does the creation of "saved-up capital," the feature which makes the man an employer instead of an employe, depend on self-denial. The common proverb says: "Riches come more by saving than by making." Political economy teaches the same; showing us that each man's saved-up capital represents exactly so much self-denial, either in him or his forefathers, in reserving present income from the indulgence of present desires, for the distant and remote uses of capital in the future.

Again, sagacity in applying, in investing, in using the previous savings, is more important than either rapid skill in earning, or self-denial in not spending. Here is your rapid, effective worker, who does earn large wages. Neither does he eat them up in immediate indulgencies. His mind is keenly bent on accumulation. But somehow, his money is ever "put into bags with holes." His ventures in investment are ill chosen and unlucky. He has an infinite amount of mental activities about plans and investments, but he ever lacks that "mother-

wit," that sagacious insight, which is a natural gift. And this picture is seen, in this country, more frequently than the instances of poverty from sheer indolence.

Now, if the industry is to be truly co-operative—if the smaller shareholders are not to be deprived of their votes in it, and directed both in their labors and the use of their earnings, by the will of the large capitalist in the concern—which means, simply their slavery—these votes which represent rashness, unthrift, self-indulgence, imprudence, must be equivalent with the votes of the sagacious—of course, then, "the concern" must come to grief. This directive will, which represents the aggregation of all the unwise who have remained among the small, or laboring shareholders, simply because they are unwise, cannot compete with the rival concern, which is directed by the best practical wisdom. The co-operative factory will be a failure; and the association will dissolve in disgust of mind, where the factory of the successful capitalist will succeed. The resolve that the present plan shall be replaced by co-operative factories, which shall succeed, amounts simply to this: "Resolved, that all laborers have the personal attributes of a Peter Cooper!" Nature and Providence concur to make men unequal; they cannot be made equal by the "resolutions" of theorists.

Once more: however co-operative, a factory must have executive officers, directors, salesmen, treasurers. These must handle all its earnings and assets. Supposing the system to receive the wide extension necessary for its healing fully the relations of labor and capital, shall we find enough *honest laboring men* in America to fill all these responsible places? Or would so large a portion of the ventures break down through defalcations of officials, as to spoil the experiment? The *morals* of the strike system do not seem very well adapted to breed strict honesty!

The other proposal is, that the quarrels of labor and capital shall be prevented, by making the National Government itself the general industrial manager. The Democratic theory is, that the Government reflects the combined will of all the people. This, then, is the right agency to direct industrial pursuits. Let the Government be in place of the corporations and capitalists.

Here several plain thoughts give us pause:

First. If this plan will be good, it will be because the Government direction will be better than that of the corporation or personal will. If, then, the Government is to confer this advantage on some industries, it must confer it on all. Otherwise we shall introduce inequalities and favoritisms most odious to Democratic theory. If it undertakes to operate all industries, it becomes a worse than Chinese despotism, a machine so vast as to crush out all individuality, and to break down hopelessly by its own weight.

Second. The success of the Government's management in all these industries must depend supremely on the competency and honesty of the Government's officials. They must constitute an immense host. Personal motives to zeal and fidelity will be largely annihilated. Is there enough of this high integrity in America, to work the huge machine? The present Government seems to have a deal of trouble in finding enough honest officials for its present small functions!

Third. The Government is practically represented in the person of the magistrate. But, by the nature of Government, "he beareth the sword." His power is essentially punitive. Transgressions against his will must be held as "crimes" and "misdemeanors." Shall his industrial functions as the manager of numberless laborers be enforced by this species of sanction? Shall the Government hold that the *employee* who has not watched his power loom, or chiseled his stone aright, is to be corrected as the petty larcener is? If not, how else? Under slavery, this negligent laborer might have been corrected by the birch; under our present hireling system, he is corrected by dismissal; but under this Governmental plan all industries, as we saw, must be equally the Government's; and whither shall it dismiss the lazy *employee*? To banishment from his country? Hardly. To idleness? If he is still to have from the Government his subsistence, this would be a mockery of punishment; rather a reward for idleness and an injustice to the true workers. There appears no mode of dealing for this industrial Government, except to treat defect of work in the citizens as larceny is treated.

This suggests the fourth and hardest question of all. If Government is to be general, not to say universal, industrial agent, it must see to it that all whom it employs and subsists do

their honest share of the work. For otherwise, the idlers would be rewarded for their sin by being set up as an aristocracy above the faithful workers, to live at ease at the others' expense. Each citizen then must be held responsible to Government for the diligent and useful employment of his time, under some efficient penalty. But the "Government" as such is an abstraction, which directly touches no man. It must act through persons clothed with official power. The meaning, then, would be that the citizens must answer to some *officeholder*, representing this sovereign Government, under some penalty, for doing his share of work. But this means *slavery*—it is its exact definition. The conception of this governmental plan is communistic; and every thoughtful man knows that communism means either anarchy or slavery. It may be objected: The Government's clerks and postmasters now work precisely under that system, and are not slaves. The reply is first, that probably they sometimes do feel that they are virtual slaves; but chiefly, that they become *employees* of Government now by their own free application, and may resign when they feel oppressed by their superiors, and thus free themselves by returning to private life. But on the plan discussed, all this would be different; the Government would be compelled to exact the adhesion of its workers,—as it does of its conscripted soldiers, whose condition is that of bondage for their term of service—and to refuse this privilege of resigning.

There appears then, no remedy, except in the firm and just administration of the laws, coupled with wise and equitable commercial and industrial legislation and the propagation of industry—economy and contentment among the people by means of Christian principles. There is no attitude for the Government towards "strikes" except the legal and righteous one. If operatives choose to form a society to forward their own interests, they have a right to do so, provided they do not infringe other people's. If the society chooses to "quarrel with their own bread and butter" by rejecting a certain work at certain wages; they have a right to do so. *But their recent employers have equal right to go into the labor market and hire others for that work at those wages; and all other laborers have equal right to that work if they are willing to the wages.*

The moment the "union" goes an inch beyond the mere

withdrawal—the moment it begins to obstruct, terrorize, or beat, or murder the employers and the new *employes*, it has become a criminal conspiracy; the State should put it down with as prompt and firm a hand as they would put down highway robbery or foreign invasion. To the clear and just mind this is clear. But is there any American State which performs this duty? Alas no! We are more likely to see the State Governors corresponding with and conciliating the “strike,” the power whose very end of existence is “to be a terror to evil doers,” bowing to the conspiracy of evil-doers, who ought to be bowed before the majesty of the law. Pitiful sight!

Property is always cautious, apparently timid, at the beginning of collisions, for it is conscious it is valuable; it has much to lose. But, because it has much to lose, property always defends itself resolutely when pressed to the wall. And when the period of caution has passed, property defends itself successfully. For money is power, and the talents of acquisition which gained the money are power. One thing has already become clear to the thought of property: that when the hour of forcible defense comes, the militia of the States will be worthless. They are too near the rioters. Property will invoke, as the only adequate force, the standing army of the United States. And, as the industrial centers are numerous and populous, the United States must have a large, a widely diffused standing army to invoke. Thus the property-holder will be educated by his needs and experiences in the hour of trial, to think of his State as the *Cipher*, the Washington Government as the only *Power*. The discontented classes, who must at last be restrained by force, will be educated to regard State authority as a shadow, and Federal authority as the substantial fear. The surest result of the approaching strife will thus be to complete the practical extinction of State sovereignty, and the consolidation of the federation into one empire. It will be an empire governing by the bayonet.

# THE DEPRESSION OF AMERICAN FARMING INTERESTS.

---

By Robert L. Dabney, D.D., LL. D.,

---

Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy and Political Science.

---

This depression is real and great, at least when compared with the other industrial interests of the country. The life of our tillers of the soil may not be so sordid as that of the Egyptian Fellahin, or of the Irish cotter tenants, but they receive less than their comparative share of the material rewards of labor. This is enough to constitute the offense both against public justice and security. It is an outrage of the equities which a boastful popular government should secure alike for all its classes. It is as real a ground of perilous discontents in the great farming classes. This depression is proved: (1) By comparing the wages of other industries with those of farm labor: A puddler in an iron mill earns ten or more dollars per day, a bricklayer in this city demands \$130 per month, a house carpenter or stone-cutter \$70 per month; but in the most prosperous part of the Southwest, the farm laborer receives at most \$20 per month, with plain rations; in the old Atlantic States, the best farm laborer receives \$8 per month and rations. Able-bodied women servants receive from 15 to 18 cents per day, with rations. But the strongest point is that the profits of agriculture cannot bear even these wretched wages. It is the almost invariable experience of employers, that the staple crops produced with hired labor, even at these wages, bring the capitalists to insolvency; and usually, the only producers who escape this result are those who till their crops by the unpaid labor of

themselves and their children. This relative depression is proved: (2) By comparing rustic with town life. Both classes have their paupers; but our comparison is drawn between the two great middle classes in rural and in town life, who employ some capital with some measures of persistent labor in the attempt to create values in the two spheres. The condition of the country family, as to long hours of labor, dress, food, dwelling and furniture equipage, amusements and recreations, is found to be comparatively hard and sordid. But the comparative conditions of town life in all these respects are easy, handsome, and even luxurious. The non-agricultural industries and employments of capital somehow enable those occupied by them to spend five fold as much in the superfluities of life. A fair typical instance may be found in the history of such a migration as was occurring forty years ago in New England in tens of thousands of cases. Two brothers, with the same blood in their veins and the same education, sold and divided the old New England homestead to migrate to Illinois. Each had the same capital—say \$3,500. One became a Chicago trader, the other a prairie farmer. The success of each has been neither above nor below the average of his class. We compare them at the end of forty years. The Chicago man is living in a brownstone front, faring sumptuously every day, indulging his family freely in fashionable amusements, regarding a five dollar opera ticket for each member of his family as an entirely reasonable indulgence: the *pater familias* assures us, with a smile of superiority, that he could not think of keeping house in Chicago on less than some \$7,000 per annum. It does not at all follow that he has created or amassed wealth: perhaps if he were forced into liquidation he would not be found the real owner of the \$3,500 he first brought to the city, but the luxurious house-keeping goes on just the same, with its enormous annihilation of values in unproductive consumption; of which the only solution is that he is consuming values created by other people's industry and capital, which he extorts from them by the jugglery of our American free institutions. Let us now seek out his brother, the prairie farmer. We find him on the little prairie farm which he bought with his patrimony forty years before, living in a board cottage. By virtue of an unusual diligence and prudence he is not mortgaged, and in consequence of the appreciation in the



price of his land, possesses probably \$5,000 or \$6,000. He still dresses in working men's clothes and cowhide boots, drives his own wagon and plow six days in every week and takes a hand in all the hardest forms of farm labor. His hands are horny and his joints ungainly and stiff with toil. His meals are plentiful, but coarse, for the demands of taxes, commissions and wages require the sale of the larger part of the butter and poultry produced by his thrifty farm. His best equipage is his spring-wagon, drawn by plough horses; the most lavish amusement of his family, an occasional visit to the fifty-cent circus. His household contains no hired domestic; wife and daughters are the only indoor drudges. His family subsist upon about \$600 per annum. I am aware that these truthful pictures are usually met with the cry that "skilled labor" deserves, and by inevitable economical law must receive, higher wages.

It is claimed that the labor of the artisan and of commerce is skilled labor, while rustic labor is unskilled. Now, this is what I *expressly* deny; and I am supported by the best economists. It is true that this Chicago trader has become skilled in certain little arts of cornering markets, inflating commissions, of which his rustic brother has remained ignorant, greatly to his credit. But the prairie farmer has developed higher intellectual skill and more varied resources, in place of the petty-fogging arts of the trader. He has learned the wisdom of the practical "crop-master," including a knowledge of the climate, seasons, soils, manures, modes of tillage, crops, and is yearly exercising upon these data the wide sagacity of the inductive philosopher. He has become a veterinary surgeon, an orchardist, a dairyman, a machinist, besides practicing a half dozen distinct trades. On his winter evenings he has read many more, and more solid, books than his brother.

Or let the artisan be compared with the farm laborer. We may be pointed to the city bricklayer, who exacts for one month of his labor six months' wages of his country brother. Oh! we shall be told, his is skilled labor! "See with what rapid dexterity he spreads a trowel full of mortar and lays brick after brick accurately to the line. The country bumpkin cannot do that!" I reply: Put a weeding-hoe into this bricklayer's hands and put him to chopping out cotton. Let us see whether he can cut away a sprig of "crop-grass" from within one-quarter of an

inch of the cotton plant, without injuring the tender stalk. Give him a cotton bag and let us see whether he can accomplish one-sixth part of a man's daily picking. Set him to harness, to adjust and to operate a mowing machine with a spirited pair of horses. He will be a fortunate bricklayer if he escapes the first morning without being sawn asunder by his own cutter blade. The truth is, while the artisan practices a few very handsome dexterities, the good farm laborer must practice a score; of which each one is as hard to learn as the dexterities of the mechanic.

(3) The steady and alarming drift of the American population from country to town reveals the depression of the farming interests. This transfer has now assumed frightful proportions. In 1790, of that American people which established its independence by revolution, one-third of one per centum lived in towns of 8,000 population or more. Since then, the steady and increasing drift has proceeded, until, in 1890, 25 per cent., or one-fourth of our whole population, is collected into towns and cities. Meantime, towns and villages under 8,000 people have been multiplied two hundredths. But these also give only the conditions of urban life. This transfer of population has been long continued, and is increasing rapidly. It has a cause. Our own observation shows us that nearly every American young man strives to quit the land and rush to the town. Some would fain persuade us that this drift does not result from the comparatively hard conditions of country life, but from the social attractions of towns, and from the ill-informed imaginations of the country youth, ignorant of the trials and failures of town life, and flattered with visions of easy and rapid wealth. This solution is not correct. Rural life has also its natural attractions, which ought to be more vivid and alluring than the garish shows of the city: the attractions of azure skies, of green fields and forests, of country sports, by field and stream, of horse-back exercise, and of the tender and sacred associations of home. Healthy young natures respond keenly to these. Were they free to act they should easily countervail the tawdry seductions of the theater, concert room, and saloons. A few days' experience of these would wear off all the tinsel of novelty: the young spirit would quickly revert to its more natural attractions. Nor is it true, that American youths are ignorant of the real conditions of city life, or be fooled with idle visions of its

glories. Country people know more of the cities than city people do of the country. No newspapers are printed in the country. It is the cities which print them, and the country people universally read them. No, our young people are well aware of whatever is hard in the conditions of city life, but they well know that the conditions of country life are harder; therefore they crowd the cities.

(4) This depression is revealed by the deep discontents of the farming population. In our day they find a renewed and ever widening expression. Some years ago the Granger movement spread over America, and engaged the interests of nearly the whole farming population. Now we have the gigantic and more determined movement of the Farmers' Alliance. We see this confounding the clearest lines of national parties, driving the most trusted statesmen from their seats of power, and urging their passionate demands for redress. Let none deceive themselves and mock at these mighty movements as blind or futile. Let none flatter themselves that farmers' cannot combine effectively. This may be true or untrue, yet unquestionably we see here the symptoms of a terrible and deep disturbance.

Whether this feverish body is destined to be wise or not, it is still vast. It represents the industry of 10,000,000 of working hands, and the direct subsistence of more than 30,000,000 of souls; indirectly it is the foundation of all other industries; the values which it creates furnish the whole material handled by all other industries, manufacturing or commercial. It is the only source of the food and raiment of all. It may be that this huge or pressed mass is to be compared to the Titan Enceladus, upon whose breast Jove piled up the whole bulk of Mount Aetna. Like Enceladus, it may not be able to throw off the super-incumbent burden, and yet its convulsions may throw lava streams of anarchy and revolution, which will rend the whole superstructure and burn up the luxurious vineyards and gardens which bedeck its upper surface.

## II.

This depression and displacement of the farming population should be the subject of grief and alarm. All orders of the American people are vitally interested in this evil.

First, this undue drift to urban life is injurious to the pub-

lic wealth. I shall not say with the old exploded French school of Economists, that agricultural industries are the only ones which really create new values. I admit that the mechanical and commercial industries create increments of value in the agricultural products upon which alone they operate. But the pretended industry of such middlemen as really contribute nothing to the perfecting and circulation of commodities is an unproductive nuisance. Such middlemen are scarcely found at all in the ranks of agricultural industry. It is in the traffic of towns that they intrude themselves successfully. These are the human hives in which these drones are found in needless numbers, consuming, but producing no honey. We have seen, also that the tendencies of American life in towns are far more luxurious than in the country. Town life consumes unproductively a far larger share of the values created in the society than does country life, by its ever increasing and insatiable pomps of living and amusement. Again, urban life in America is a terrible consumer of the human species; its bills of mortality show a large percentage of death. Especially is the American city a devourer of infant life. The stifling heats and polluted atmosphere of the lanes and alleys inhabited by the poor in mid-summer sweep away the innocents almost as fast as they come into the world.

Perhaps it is the vice of our American home life that only a small part of the youth reared in cities grow into habits of steady industry. The ranks of city business have to be continually refilled from the country. The sons and grandsons of those who have prospered in town are unable to perpetuate their parents' prosperity. Some are sybarites, some are sots. The country has to be drained afresh of its sturdy sons in order to replenish the ranks of industry. Jefferson did not much mistake when he declared, "That great cities are but great ulcers upon the body politic." The urban population become unsafe depositories for political power.

The minute specification of occupations breeds a narrow one-sidedness of mind, the people with a great conceit of their own intelligence, become overweening and excitable; revolutions always begin in cities. It is always municipal politics which first breed political corruption in America. A Tammany could only exist in a great city. Once more history shows that the

martial virtues grow chiefly among the rural population. Shall we be reminded of the New York Seventh regiment and similar amateur corps in our pompous cities. What part have these performed in actual warfare? A large portion of their rank and file was born and reared in the country. Cromwell found the London train bands in the parliamentary army of no account in the shocks of battle. Their ranks were filled, he says, chiefly with decayed tapsters and serving men, the squadrons of Prince Rupert, formed of country gentlemen, rode them down like herds of sheep. Convinced that the liberties of his country could never be defended by such soldiers as these, Cromwell went into the country of Huntingdonshire and there recruited his regiment of Ironsides from the sons of the yeoman freeholders. Thus he formed that terrible body, which carried victory upon its bayonet through every subsequent battlefield, which never met an enemy, whether it was the chivalry of England, of France or of Spain, without both defeating and destroying him. The Stonewall brigade was recruited by Jackson from the sons of the farmers in the Valley of Virginia. Indeed, the armies of the Confederacy were all armies of the farmers; and such was their powers that it required a gigantic struggle of four years to enable the plutocracy and proletariat of the combined world to overthrow them. But they, with their system of rural life, have been suppressed.

Woe to the land, to gathering ills a prey  
Where wealth increases, and where men decay.  
—Goldsmith.

### III.

Every patriot, consequently, should wish to find a remedy for this continental evil of agricultural depression; but a remedy can only be found by ascertaining the causes of the disease. If our efforts are directed to a mistaken cause, they will work only evil and not benefit.

I do not, for instance, find the cause of this depression in the existing volume of American currency: nor do I see any hope of a remedy in its inflation. Every true friend of the farmer sees his hopes directed to this false quarter with sorrow. For we are aware all history and science prove that such inflation can only aggravate the evils which now gall him into justifiable resentment. So evident is this to persons well in-

formed, that when they see the pretended advisers of the Alliance misleading it in this direction, it is hard to suppress the suspicion that they are the hired agents of the real oppressors of the country, practicing to perpetuate their domination by misdirecting the efforts of the sufferers.

But would not inflation of currency enable the farmer to sell his products at a higher nominal price? Yes, for a time, but at a deadly ulterior cost to the farmer.

For first, that inflation of currency which would raise the nominal price of the farmer's products must at the same time raise the price of all the other commodities which the farmer wishes to purchase.

Let us suppose that inflation enables him to sell the cotton bale, which before had brought him \$40, for \$80. He must now pay at least \$80 for \$40 worth of those goods which he needed to buy with that cotton bale for his farm and family. What has he gained by the change except the childish amusement, or more probably the fatigue of counting twice as many dollars?

But second, when inflation shall have raised the nominal price of his cotton bale to \$80 he will not be able to purchase that return of commodities for his farm and family for \$80, more probably he will have to pay \$100 for them. For it is an established fact in history that when inflation is proceeding, land values and their products respond more slowly to the stimulus of prices than other species of goods. There is a plain reason for this: The farmer's values cannot be made to change hands so quickly as the commodities of the merchant, and as everybody knows that this rise of price, stimulated by inflation, is precarious and must be temporary. Nobody is so foolish as to venture a full increase of price upon these slowly moving land values. This was exactly verified in 1862, when the rapid inflation of the Confederate currency was stimulating prices. The prices of lands and negroes had scarcely begun to move perceptively, when those of mercantile commodities had been inflated four or five hundred per cent. Thus it must ever be, by the time inflation shall have raised the price of the farmer's cotton bale from \$40 to \$80 it will have raised the prices of the goods which he must purchase with that cotton bale to \$100 or \$120.

Third. Inflation of currency must always be temporary.

Like a fever in a natural body, it must cure itself after a short time or kill the patient. This has been the history of every inflation, ancient or modern. There is a reason for this, as unerring and absolute as the gravity which makes rivers run down hill. So, a portion of the money in the region of inflation must immediately begin to flow out into neighboring societies, where currency is not inflated. Why do unthinking people desire inflation? Because it raises prices. But this means simply that the money now has less purchasing power within the region of inflation than without it. And now the self-interest of every human being who has any of this money prompts him to send it away from the place where it has less purchasing power to the places where it has more. If it were found that cotton could be sold for more in Galveston than in Liverpool, by the amount of any margin above the freight and insurances, cotton would immediately begin to come back from Liverpool to Galveston. But of all commodities, money is the quickest to respond to this inevitable law of trade, because it is the most readily handled of all. Unless a society cuts itself off absolutely from all business relations with all other societies, it is as impossible for it to maintain permanent inflation as for the engineer to sustain a permanent mountain of water upon the fluctuating bosom of the Gulf. Inflation sooner or later cures itself, and with it nominal prices decline again.

In the fourth place, when this constriction of currency begins, money appreciates in value; that is to say, its purchasing power is now increasing; but commodities depreciate in value. That is to say, any given quantity of them demands less money. But the money, which is appreciating, is chiefly in the hands of the money-lending and trading classes. It is the commodities which are depreciating which are in the hands of the agricultural classes. Thus, whenever the inevitable constriction begins, it is they who lose and the trading classes who gain. Inflation has encouraged the farming classes to make debts; these must now be paid off with their crops and lands at depreciated prices. Thus again it is the farmers who suffer. Some will ask, perhaps, why prudent foresight could not be exercised in view of the coming constriction, so as to adjust one's business to it, and avoid these losses. I answer: It is precisely the money-lending and trading classes who are in a position to exercise

that foresight, and it is precisely the farmers who are not. These live scattered through the country; they are engrossed with their crops and stock; they are the last to learn the news of the approaching constriction of currency and changes of values. Even if they foresee, they find themselves in no condition to make beneficial use of their foresight, because the money, which is appreciating, they have not ready; the commodities which are depreciating are chiefly what they have to dispose of. But the trading classes live in the centers of financial news. They are the first to learn of coming changes; ready money is the crop which they handle. Hence it is they who are sure to make advantage of the fluctuations. Inflation is bad for the business and bad for the morals of all classes; but it is worst of all for the farmers.

Our country has lately seen an exact illustration of these principles brought out upon a gigantic scale. The Federal currency which replaced the Confederate in 1865 was a paper currency inflated about fifty per cent. This inflation, according to the universal rule, cured itself. The greenback dollar approached more and more nearly in value to the gold dollar until, in 1872, one was equal to the other, and specie payments were spontaneously resumed. No law was passed by State or Federal government to force that result. The financial wiseakers seemed afraid to legislate about it. Specie resumption came of itself. The gold room died of itself and was closed. Some may attempt to argue that the result was not spontaneous, but was virtually forced by the legislation of the radical party contracting the volume of the Federal treasury notes during those years. It is true the lavish issue made of those notes during the war was arrested; a large part of them were redeemed and withdrawn from circulation, but every dollar thus withdrawn was redeemed with some other kind of circulating dollars, silver, gold or national bank notes; and there was nothing to forbid these from entering the circulation and filling the precise place there of the treasury notes withdrawn. Again, silver and gold mining was revived and rapidly extended during those years, throwing into the veins of the national circulation annually multiplying millions of the money metals. Still again, during those years a high war tariff was enforced. The avowed tendency of such tariffs is to create the so-called "balance of trade"



which causes foreign currency instead of imported commodities in large part to flow into the "protected" country. And last the chaste national banking law was in full force, offering unlimited incorporation to all creditors of the government, and enticing them to use the banking privilege freely to issue national bank notes by that cunning arrangement which enabled the bond-holders "to eat their cake and have it too." Nothing but the natural and inevitable principles of currency restricted the indefinite multiplication of national bank notes. This inflation cured itself, without the aid of human legislation or any force from without. Let us now look at the consequences of this constriction upon the planters of the country. Cotton was continually depreciating in price, while money was appreciating. Debts created at the inflated figures must now be paid with the proceeds of cotton sold at declining figures. The crop mortgages consumed the substance of the planters with a more deadly voracity from year to year, until at the end of the period money lenders and commission merchants owned all that was left and the planters were paupers. The old proverb saith: "Dame experience keeps a good school, though a hard one"; but it is the only one fools will learn in. The leaders who are now attempting to seduce the Farmers' Alliance into schemes of inflation evidently give their pupils credit for even a less amount of brains than is found in the unfortunate alumni of the severe dame.

2nd. The earliest cause of the decay of the American farming interests was the overthrow of the labor system of the South by the war between the States and its consequent measures. I feel no fear of offending any political sensibilities when citing this cause, since it is introduced not for its political bearings, but solely for its economic instruction, and since I cite no facts except those given by the government of the United States itself. The census returns of that government testify that up to 1860 the Southern labor system had been most fruitful and most productive of public and private wealth of any labor system in the country. In 1860 the South, with a little more than 12,000,000 of souls, possessed taxable values to the amount of \$6,760,000,000. In 1880, while the souls were 17,000,000, the taxable values amounted in round numbers to \$3,250,000,000. That this immense collapse of wealth had not been the work chiefly of

war is proved by the testimony of the government, whose census in 1870 found the Southern people still possessed of taxable values to the amount of about \$4,780,000.000. The Southern labor system had been destroyed, and with it this fruitful fountain of national wealth was dried up to flow no more. I presume no one can be so unthinking as to suppose that this result affected the South alone. The profits of civilized society are reciprocal. When men wish to prosper they must "live and let live." Commodities produced beyond the actual wants of the producer are of no value unless there is somewhere a demand for them. Without an exterior demand they must rot unsold.

It is not merely the presence of numerous people with hungry desires which creates commercial demand: these people must also possess something to buy with, which is a value to the vendors. Before 1860 the South, with its lavish production of wealth, bought lavishly of the products of the States north of them, and that at liberal prices. They bought directly immense volumes of the agricultural products of those States. They assisted their agriculture indirectly, also, by buying huge volumes of their manufactured products. In 1880 there remained in the South abundance of hungry desires, but little was left wherewith to buy for their gratification. The agricultural prostration of the South has reacted against the North by an inevitable law, as wise Southern statesmen forewarned the country; measures of reconstruction have been a boomerang, which has rebounded, and struck in the rear only less severely than in the front. This immense loss to both sections is, of course, irreparable: the wisest economic science provides no remedy for it. An arrogant but brutish pride may tempt men to avert their eyes from incontestable facts, or even to deny them, because they cannot now be repaired. But true wisdom is more humble, as well as more honest, and is glad to learn from every fact, however mortifying.

3rd. I find a second complicated and powerful set of causes for agricultural depression, which have become almost universal in America in the form of artificial combinations for monopolies. Naturally and equitably the ratio of supply and demand ought to determine the price, which producers shall receive for any class of services or products they offer. If one class of producers can artificially violate the law of supply and

demand, this must of course be by throwing the loss upon consumers of that class of services or values. For instance, let certain iron workers combine, create an artificial monopoly of their services and thus inflate their price by means of the restrictive rules of a labor union, then that element of unjust monopoly price must be present in the agricultural machine which the farmer buys. In paying for it he has paid in addition to the fair cost of the raw materials, interest on capital, wages of laborers and equitable commercial profit, a further monopoly price to these laborers, and this remains an uncompensated plunder upon the farmer's earnings, unless he can create some monopoly claim upon other fellow citizens by which to "recoup" himself, but this the farmer can never do. Now most Americans are not willing to let the equitable law of supply and demand regulate their gains, hence nearly every industry except the farmers is now organized into artificial monopolies. The prices of nearly all of the services of mechanical, manufacturing and mining labor are manipulated by the Knights of Labor and other labor unions. The Printers' Typographical Union legislates that we shall pay more than fair market price for type setting and thus for all the books and newspapers; medical associations fix the prices at which we must be physiced; legal associations forbid the gravitation of fees for suits toward that modest price which the over-supply of legal talent would otherwise bring about. The commission merchants foreordain what per centage of charges, real and imaginary, they shall levy upon the farmer's produce, which are never remitted however disastrous to him their sales of his property may prove. The American Nail Makers' Association, instead of observing the law of supply and demand, ordains what we shall pay for each nail driven in America. The salt makers order the shutting up of nature's fountains whenever she seems likely to cheapen that article of prime necessity by a more liberal outflow of her waters. The Lake Superior Copper Company legislates that every copper wire used by Americans shall cost double price of that which the same company sells to Europeans. The Standard Oil Company inflates the price of petroleum and the other oils and depresses that of the farmer's cotton seed. The sugar trust regulates the price at which we shall taste the sweets of life. There is now a cigarette trust fixing the monopoly price at which our

boys shall poison themselves and pollute the atmosphere around them, the carrying companies of the country make all their freight charges upon the products of agriculture or upon the return goods which these procure. Nearly all these companies inflate these charges either by watering their stock and loading their roads with unnecessary bonds, the proceeds of which they have silently appropriated; and they then load the produce of the country with such freight charges as shall pay dividends both upon the actual and the fictitious values. Thus every such bond or share of stock beyond the actual costs of the roads and their equipments becomes a perpetual lien upon the lands and products of the farmers, whom they profess to serve, levying upon them for all time both a just and an unjust profit. But the list becomes tiresome, and now its latest addition is the American Book Publishing Company, which proposes to levy a monopoly upon the brain food of every boy and girl on the continent.

The farmers remain one of the two great industries which has hitherto been unable to combine to engross the earnings of others, or even to protect itself against engrossers. This, I presume, is not because the farmers are less intelligent or less human than the other classes, but because they are so numerous, so separated by their homes and pursuits, so divided in interest by geographic and climatic causes, by the wide diversity and the very immensity of their products. Effective combinations for monopoly can never become feasible for them. Nor do they desire them. What they righteously demand is means to protect themselves against other monopolies. How to do this is a sufficiently hard problem for them.

The other great class of Americans found in the same helpless condition is the class of home makers. The 10,000,000 of American wives, mothers and sisters who perform more unremitting toil for smaller compensation than even the tillers of the soil. It would be well for them to make common cause with the Farmers Alliance. The other industries manage to overrule the equitable laws of supply and demand by their artifices, the farming interests has to accept, for the immense mass of values it creates, less than the natural law of supply and demand would apportion them.

4th. It is these unfair conditions which cause the enor-

mous taxation of the American Government to press with such crushing weight upon the farming interests. It is difficult to ascertain the real aggregate of the Federal, the State, the county and the municipal taxes which our people have to bear. Enormous sums are levied in the irregular and vague forms of sheriffs' and clerks' fees. We shall not go far wrong in estimating the total of \$20.00 per capita for every American soul. These taxes are so diversified and the modes of collection varied with such ill-starred ingenuity that the victims are scarcely aware of their own burdens. The average farmer whose family includes five souls will be much mistaken in supposing that he gets off by paying one hundred dollars, i. e., \$20.00 for each soul in his house. Many pauper families almost wholly escape assessment. The personal property of the rich is often secreted from taxation to a shameful extent, but the assets of the farmer remain visible and palpable. The governments are remorseless in their demands of the \$20.00 from each soul. Hence those who have property and who cannot and do not secrete it from taxation must pay in addition to their own shares the shares of all the paupers and all the deceivers. No additional words are requisite to show how hardly these exactions must press upon those industries whose capital and labor are already yielding the scantiest returns. Such are the industries of the American farmer. For,

5. The Federal legislation is so adjusted as to be most inimical to his rights and interests. I refer chiefly to the so-called protective system of the United States, which is the prime source of the worst evils now crushing the farming interests in America. I have explained how the various rings and trusts operate to filch away the farmer's earnings without giving him any just equivalent. It is the tariff which provides the conditions of success for all these monopolies. As long as these fatal conditions subsist it is not probable that the oppressed classes will find any remedy. American ingenuity will always invent ways to evade the operation of the principles of the common law against forestalling and regrating, and any statutes passed by the States and by Congress, in a country burdened with such an administration of justice as ours. The resort to free trade would of itself abolish the conditions requisite to the success of these iniquities so that they would perish of themselves. We

sec, for instance, the new book trust preparing its machinery to levy a monopoly-profit, in addition to equitable manufacturing and commercial profits, upon every school child in America. Let Congress only pass, in one line, the righteous statute removing all tariffs upon school books, and this gigantic fraud would be checkmated at once. The best and cheapest printers in the world, in Leipsig, Halle, Brussels, Edinburg, would in a few weeks place in our seaports ship loads of American school books, printed in our own language, with perfect accuracy, at half the price of the monopolies.

Every one understands that when the government levies tariff imposts upon imported goods, the final consumer of those goods inevitably pays both the value of those goods, with reasonable commercial profits thereon, and the tariff tax in addition, increased by parallel charges of profits and commissions upon it also.

But the tendency of the system is to enable American producers of similar goods to enhance the prices of them also to the same level. This tendency may be partially checked by mutual home competition, but here come in all the monopoly rings and combinations designed to deprive the consumers of this check of home competition. Were this tendency of tariff laws fully realized their result would be that consumers would pay as simple plunder to private fellow-citizens four dollars of unearned profits for every dollar carried by the tariffs into the Federal treasury. This is bad enough; but it only reveals the small beginnings of the injustice wrought by the protective system upon the great farming classes. To comprehend the whole the reactionary influence of the protective system against the prices of all the great export staples created by the tillers of the soil must be clearly understood. By the term "Export Staples" we mean all those classes of commodities which are produced in America in larger quantities than Americans can consume. This over plus of each class of commodities requires and seeks a foreign market, for without this it must only be wasted by needlessly lavish use at home or rot unconsumed. Either result is a loss to the producers. Let, now, these indisputable facts be combined: First. International traffic must be mainly barter of goods for goods; it cannot be mainly the sale of our goods for the money of our national neighbors, for only the gold and

silver money of one nation can pass to another for the purchase of its goods. It is impossible that one nation's paper money can be made to circulate as currency within another nation. It is equally impossible that one nation can part annually with successive portions of its metallic money to pay for the goods of another nation which it desired to acquire. The reason is absolute: Very soon the volume of metallic currency in the purchasing nation would be relatively so reduced that money would be appreciated, the prices of commodities depreciated, and further importations of them for sale would become impossible. Such a form of international trade is therefore inevitably self-arresting. If international trade is to go on at all it must be the barter of goods for goods. Only so much specie can pass backwards and forwards as will equalize the small temporary oscillations in the balance of trade and in stirring exchange.

Second. All tariffs are restrictive upon free international barter. They are intended to be such. It is their boast to be such. If they did not operate to restrict the influx of imported goods, they would utterly fail to operate as protective of home manufactories. Hence, when the United States enacts that certain goods imported from Great Britain shall pay a tariff impost, it thereby enacts a restriction upon the volume of such goods possible to be exported to us by Great Britain.

Third. This at once operates as a restriction upon the purchasing power of all foreign nations as to all our Export Staples.

It is their interest to purchase freely of our export staples at good prices, provided we will let them pay in the various useful goods which they produce at such moderate prices and which we need. But the tariff system says to them: "No, you shall not buy freely of our great export staples which we so much need to sell; for we will not take freely of those cheap and useful goods which you produce, and which we need, and with which alone it is possible for you to pay for what we send you." Let us instance our cotton crop. It is impossible for American spinners to consume annually more than two-fifths of it. Shall the rest rot unspun? Great Britain says to us: We like your cotton; it is good; we spin something more than 2,000,000 bales per annum, and cannot rear one pound in England; we are only too glad to make you a good market at good prices for that

vast portion of your surplus, provided you will let us pay you in the only things with which it is possible for us to pay, viz: our cheap and excellent manufactured goods which will be so useful to you. But now comes in the American tariff and forbids Great Britain doing this good part by our cotton surplus. It sternly restricts the quantity of British goods which can be sent into America to pay for cotton, and thereby restricts the purchasing power of Britain as to our cotton. Britain must consequently buy less of our surplus, and that at reduced prices.

The actual result is that, instead of buying every pound she spins from us, which she would gladly do, our tariff laws force her to buy as little as possible from us and at the worst possible prices, and to seek a supply for her deficit of cotton from the unfriendly climates of Hindoostan and from Egypt and Brazil, which are glad to sell the cotton they rear to her without this senseless restriction. This great instance shows how surely tariff restrictions operate against the prices of all our export staples.

Fourth. The foreign price of these staples inevitably rules the prices of all sold at home. Thus the tariff system, by injuring the price of that portion sold abroad, injures the price of every bushel and every pound produced upon the whole continent. Is any one ignorant enough to doubt this? Does not every intelligent person know that every reaction against the price of grain in Mark Lane, of tobacco at the London docks, of cotton in Liverpool, immediately depresses the prices of these staples in every American city. Let cotton decline five points in Liverpool to-day; let Hubbard & Price report the price to-morrow morning on the blackboard of the New York Cotton Exchange. Down goes cotton in New York five points. As soon as the telegraph can bring the news to Galveston, down goes the price there five points, and by day after to-morrow there will not be a hamlet in Texas where the retail purchaser will not insist upon a reduction of five points in his price.

Let us now glance at the quantity of these export staples created by American tillers of the soil. In 1891 they produced 2,000,000,000 bushels of Indian corn, 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, more than this quantity of oats, eight and one-third millions of bales of cotton, 8,000,000,000 pounds of tobacco, besides dairy products, beef products, hog products, naval stores



and other commodities. The selling price of all this immense mass of values has been depressed against the tillers of the soil by this reflex operation of tariff laws. And for what end? That inflated and unrighteous profits may be piled up in the pockets of a few thousand manufacturing capitalists. And this is American republicanism? We need no longer wonder at the cruel depression of the American farming interests.

The price of ten cents per pound for cotton leaves to the planter a bare chance of a scanty profit. In this month of January, 1892, yeomen farmers have been selling their cotton in the streets of Austin at a heart breaking price of five cents per pound. *Last year the remorseless McKinley tariff went into operation.* My argument shows that we have here not only the *post-hoc* but the *propter-hoc*. But meantime the prairie farmer's wheat has advanced from 80 cents per bushel to \$1.05? Yes. But is it possible that human effrontery and ignorance could ascribe this beneficial result to the McKinley tariff? We are told that this impossibility has actually been accomplished successfully in the Northwest by protectionist demagogues. "The force of nature can no farther go." It would be a curious problem, whether the impudence of the deceivers or the stupidity of the deceived is the more gigantic. My argument has demonstrated that a restrictive system can only act adversely against the price of any and every export staple.

The American tariff is operating adversely to-day against the price of American wheat. This slight rise (which saves the prairie farmers for a moment from despair) is purely the result of a great and sudden dearth of breadstuff among nearly all the 280,000,000 of Europeans. Such a stimulus, but for the blighting influence of our tariff, should have sent American wheat up, not to the poor price of \$1.05 per bushel, but to \$1.60. Under the twenty per cent. tariffs which prevailed from 1846 to 1861, smaller stimuli in European markets again and again sent the price of American wheat up to \$1.75 per bushel.

It will be easily perceived from the above analysis that I have no quack nostrums to propose to the farmers as remedies for their wrongs. The political measures which are due to them and which would relieve the unjust pressure, are the honest and simple ones of old Southern statesmen.

Economical government, reduced taxation, the arrest and

repeal of all class legislation and a swift return to strictly revenue tariffs. Will the great producing classes see their true remedy and combine in their strength to exact of our rulers its faithful application? I fear not. Impatience misleads many. The evil is chronic. Safe and wholesome remedies will only operate slowly. The money oligarchy has its hired advocates everywhere afield, who misdirect the views of the people. It is to be feared the greatest obstacle to true reform lies here; the real remedies are simple and honest, but the political mind of America is largely dishonest. The true theory of republican government taught by the fathers of America was this: That the sole function of civil government is to protect the equitable rights of all, while it bestows class privileges on none, and leaves each free citizen to work out his own preferred welfare by his own honest exertions in his individual independence. But the popular conception of government has come to be that it is a complicated and powerful machine, to be manipulated for the advantage of whatever cliques can seize the control of it, so as to juggle other people's earnings into their pockets. Consequently the prevalent picture in our political movements is this: The oppressing clique struggles by every means, fair and foul, to retain its hold of the crank of the lucrative machine. The oppressed clique does not seek the restoration of justice to all. That is too simple and old fashioned. No; what it seeks is to grasp in its turn the crank of the machine, in order to make it so revolve as to recoup its losses, avenge itself upon its oppressors, and imitate their selfish use of power. The danger is that amidst these species of struggles patriotism and political morality will perish. Parties will become more venal and a constantly narrowing oligarchy of wealth will take the place of true republicanism.

If the great agricultural class does not possess the equity, wisdom and firmness to enforce the righteous remedy, for no other class will find its interests in doing it, we may consider free government in America as doomed.

## ‘THE DOLLAR OF THE DADDIES.’

---

(From the Houston Post, March, 1892.)

---

Such has been the very war-cry of the so-called “silver men” in politics. They claim continually that the standard silver dollar known as the “Bland dollar” is precisely the dollar of our daddies and that therefore they demand it. Now the meaning of this claim is, that the precedent of the Federal government, the example of its founders, and the weight of their wisdom and patriotism, justify the continued and unlimited coinage of this dollar, containing three hundred and seventy-one grains of pure silver. I shall show that this plea fathers, in form and name, but not in reality and worth, that is uncandid and false, that this coin is now the dollar of our were those wise old patriots here now, instead of fathering it they would most certainly reject it, from the force of the very principles by which they shaped the money policy of the country. The phrase is only a catch-word to juggle with, not an argument to reason from. Some explanation is needed to evince this.

It is true that our fathers adopted the “double standard” for the Federal coinage, and that, by the advice of an excellent financier, Mr. Albert Gallatin. The “single standard” makes both gold and silver money for the people and coins both for their use, just as truly as the double standard. The difference between the two plans is just this: the single standard makes silver coins “legal tender” for debts only to small amounts (say up to ten dollars (\$10), while for all larger debts gold coins alone are legal tender. The plan of the “double standard” makes the silver and gold coins both legal tender for debts of any amount, however large, at the option of debtors. That alone is the essential point of difference. The results which are designed and which follow in fact from the two plans are

these: The single standard gives the people both silver money and gold money to buy and sell with, just as the people prefer the one or the other, and indeed it provides the people as much silver money as they find it convenient to use in preference to gold; but it does not enable debtors to compel their creditors by force of law to take silver coins (except in very small amounts) as the forcible measure and standard of the values which they got from their creditors and which debtors are bound to return to them when pay day comes. The law confers that power only on gold coins: *that is all*. I repeat, the law of the single standard allows the people to enjoy either silver or gold coins as measures of value in trading with each other, just as they choose to agree together at the time; but the law refuses to empower debtors to force anything on their creditors as the fixed standard of values, to be receivable when pay day comes, except gold coins. Such and no more is the plan of the single standard in those great nations which have adopted it, Russia, Germany and Great Britain; and such was the whole extent of the much abused law of 1873 adopting the single standard for the United States. The designed and actual result of the double standard is that it enables all debtors to compel their creditors, by force of law, to take either silver or gold coins, as the standard of values received, at the debtor's option.

Every truly scientific writer and statesman recommends the single standard, in all countries: and *this for two reasons; one* is that the plan of double standard is always liable to become dishonest and mischievous unless it be corrected by a means very expensive and troublesome. *The other is* that this plan always tends to make silver money, or gold money, or both more scarce, and thus to deprive the people of the convenience of having plenty of both kinds in use. Whereas the single standard tends to keep them both in circulation and especially plenty of silver. So that the advocates of double standard and free coinage are exactly wrong in telling the people that their plan will keep more silver in circulation. This may look strange at first, but the following facts make it plain.

These metals are not only the materials of coinage, but, always articles of traffic in commerce. No laws and no power on earth can prevent this. As articles of traffic, they must

fluctuate in relative value under the well known law of supply and demand, just as iron, cotton, wheat, and tobacco fluctuate. If the annual crop of silver remains the same, while the general demand for it diminishes, its price must fall. If the demand remains as before and the crop increases the price must fall. If the annual crop increases faster than the demand the price must fall, but if the relation of supply and demand in the case of gold remains permanent while either of these changes happens to silver it must become cheaper relatively to gold. That is, if sixteen ounces of silver sufficed before to buy one ounce of gold in metal markets, it will now require more than sixteen ounces of silver. Or, a quantity of wheat which would before buy sixteen ounces of silver or one ounce of gold indifferently will now buy more than sixteen ounces of silver, and still only one ounce of gold.

If a government persists in the plan of the double standard after the silver in its dollar has thus come to be worth less than a dollar it begins to practice a wrong, and to unsettle its standard of values. As a rocking foundation is no real foundation at all for a house, so an unsettled standard is no standard. Such a coinage instead of regulating traffic in a wholesome manner tends to work confusion and disturbance in all business transactions. For instance, two citizens in the exercise of their rightful freedom have covenanted that the one shall give to the other certain goods to be valued at one thousand dollars and to be paid for by that number of these coins. But what does "dollar" mean? Clearly the government when undertaking to regulate that matter ought to give but one answer. To give two different ones is confusion. Does "dollar" mean twenty-three and one-fifth grains of pure gold? Or does it mean three hundred and seventy-one grains of pure silver? But these are now quite different values! One of the mischiefs always attending this confusion is: *That it starts circulation in currency itself*, besides inflaming speculation in all other kinds of goods bought and sold with currency. This is ever a curse and let it be noted that it is the small money-lending class which always profits. In the end, it is the large borrowing class which always loses, when currency itself is speculated in. Especially is this true against the farmers. And the reason is perfectly simple and certain. It is the money

lending class which is always the most quickly informed of the shifts and fluctuations between the two currencies because it is their business to study them and they live just in the centers of action; while the farmers, scattered over the country and busy in their fields, are the last to find out what is coming. Moreover the money lending class is most able to produce changes and shifts in the currencies, which it is their business to handle in large quantities. Hence we see, that the politicians make two most absurd blunders when they tell the farmers that it is to their interest to have abundant "soft money" or silver money of inferior value; and that the Wall street men advocate a single standard and oppose free silver coinage of standard dollars from selfish greed. The self interest of the money lending class would lead them to desire another period of unequal currencies, for they know that they get rich fastest in such times, and the debtor class suffers most. And it is precisely the farming class which in the outcome always suffers by "soft money." Does the abundance of this seem for a time to raise the price of farm products? It is a miserable cheat; for when settling day comes, as come it must, the farmers always find that they have been paid for what they have to sell with cheap money and now have to pay what they owe in dear money. The farmers of the United States may be sure that Mr. Cleveland is their truest and best friend here. He is a learned, wise and honest man: let the farmers listen to him if they wish to know what is for their good.

This is proved by our recent history from 1862 to 1871 when the country had two different currencies, paper and metallic; then it was the famous gold room seethed every day like a caldron. It was then the foundations were laid for those colossal fortunes in the hands of a few, which all men now see to be so threatening to the rights and welfare of the people. It was then the grand impulse was given to that fatal process which, ever since, has been making the rich richer and the poor poorer. Let the experience of that time also teach the farmers the other truth; that in a time of "soft money" it is they who suffer, and it is the money lending class which gains. The period I have marked was a time of soft money. When the war between the States ended the Federal paper money quickly became less depreciated, so that one and a half dollars of it

were equal to one gold or silver dollar; and the paper money gradually appreciated. But it was soft money until the resumption of specie payments. Now who was it that got rich during that period? It was the bankers and commission merchants who lent advances to farmers, while the farmers got poorer and poorer. Indeed the lending class almost ate up the farming class bodily. That was the epoch when Richardson, of Jackson, Miss., from being a little commission merchant, became the largest cotton planter in the world, through the agency of his advances and crop mortgages. Let farmers learn by experience.

The silver shouters tell the farmers that the unlimited coinage of silver dollars of inferior value is the way to give them abundance of silver money; which I expressly deny. It is the very way to make money of both kinds scarcer. Again I appeal to stubborn facts. Under the Bland law, the United States has coined more than three hundred millions of these inferior silver dollars. Meantime Great Britain, in her wisdom, retains the single standard and limited coinage of silver. *But this very year the people of the United States are employing only \$1.90 per capita of silver money; while the people of Great Britain are employing \$2.85 per capita!* The rest of our silver coinage lies obstinately in the vaults of the treasury; the people will not take it out and handle it, though the government coaxes and almost bribes them to do so. Do these facts look strange? They are explained by a simple view of human nature. The people know in spite of the demagogues that these Bland dollars *are inferior* in commercial value, each one is worth, in fact, less than 75 cents. Now let an article which the people know to be inferior be offered for their use on two plans: Let the one plan be to offer it to their free option and say to them, "Here it is, it is an inferior article; you can use it if you choose wherever your convenience calls for it, or you can let it alone." The other plan says to the people, "This article, which you believe to be inferior, you shall be made to take as superior, even equal to the best, and if you take it when pay day comes, the law will compel you to pay back in the best and dearest." Every one who knows human nature knows that the first plan will circulate far more of that article than the second plan. Suppose it were an inferior grade

of butter, or flour, or cotton, cloth, or lard; let any grocer or housekeeper answer. Leave them free to settle at an inferior price for the inferior article according to their own judgment, and convenience will prompt them to use a good deal of it; but when you make a law that the inferior shall be priced as high as the best, everybody naturally resolves to have as little to do with it as possible. It is the same with the people's money.

The other consequence of our double standard with an inferior silver dollar as legal tender for all amounts is still more certain: it will ultimately drive away all the gold coin. The people have been hearing lately of "Gresham's law." This is a principle in the science of currency so called because that great man explained and proved it so well 300 years ago. It is this: Where the law makes two kinds of money to be currency of which one is worse than the other, the worse kind always tends to drive the better kind out of circulation and out of the hands of the people. So long as the quantity of the worse currency is quite limited the great inconvenience of having too little currency of either kind may check this natural tendency, keeping some of the better currency in circulation, temporarily. But the tendency is at work all the time, and when the quantity of the worst money is increased enough to fill the natural channels of trade all the good money goes away. This also is but nature and common sense. Let any man ask himself; suppose he were going to buy a \$10 coat with two kinds of money in his pocket, one kind commercially worth 25 per cent. more than the other, while the law empowered him to force the merchant to take 10 of either kind as \$10. He also knows that there is a money broker whom he can reach, who will give him twelve of the meaner dollars for ten of his better kind. What will he be inclined to do? Of course, he will keep back the better dollars and force the merchant to take the meaner ones; he gains \$2 by it. Such is exactly the position of all money dealers in financial centers. They find that they can make a Bland dollar, by virtue of bad law, buy a gold dollar's worth inside the United States, while outside it will pay only 75 cents. Of course then, whenever they have money to pay in Europe, India, China, or Australia, they are going to send gold money to pay it, while they keep the meaner silver money to put off on their fellow citizens. The tendency is as inevitable



as any other law of nature. Let free coinage go on and sooner or later the last American gold coin will go out of American circulation.

Facts prove this. Between 1792 and 1834 silver had cheapened a little in the commercial markets of the world. At the later date a gold eagle (\$10) sold for \$10.65 in silver. This was an appreciation of a little over six per cent.; the consequence was that all the gold coinage of the United States went entirely out of circulation among the people. There was nothing but silver, bank notes, and wretched shin plasters. One might as well have looked for feathers from angels' wings in the hands of the people as for the gold coins of their own government. Congress saw the necessity of restoring commercial equality of value between its silver dollars and its gold ones. It effected this by the law of 1834, which reduced the quantity of virgin metal in the gold eagle from 247 1-2 grains to 232 grains, or about six per cent. Then their gold money began to stay and circulate at home. Now if a difference of six per cent. in value sent all our gold coin out of circulation, what will a difference of 25 per cent. do? It must, for the stronger reason, banish all our gold. Circumstances may delay the flow; they cannot stop it finally. The tendency in this law of currency is as infallible as the tendency of rivers to run down hill. A dam across a stream may check the current until the pond is full: then it continues to run down hill as before.

I have now reached the place to signalize the dishonesty of the jockey "catch-word," the dollar of our daddies. This claim should mean, were it not a contemptible fraud, that the fathers of the government committed themselves for all time to a dollar of 371 grains, irrespective of fluctuations in the relative price of silver. But this is precisely what they never did. Their example to us was to make a silver dollar equal in commercial value to their gold dollar and to make whatever changes afterwards might be needed to keep them equal. Why did they put just 371 grains of pure silver into their standard dollar in 1792? See Hamilton, Jefferson and Gallatin. Because 15 ounces of silver would then buy 1 ounce of gold, at which ratio the 371 grains of silver exactly equaled in value the tenth part of 247 1-2 grains of gold allotted to the gold dollar. In 1834, when silver had fallen so that it took 16

ounces to buy an ounce of gold, the fathers recognized the need and duty of making a change in the coinage to equalize the two kinds. This they did by lightening the gold coin 6 per cent. If the silver men now are not trying to cheat the people, by this claim of the fathers' precedent, let them do what their fathers did, equalize the two kinds of dollars. If those fathers were here now they would effect this by putting one-fourth more silver into the standard dollar. Not by taking one-fourth of the gold out of the gold dollar. Because they would have sense enough to know that such a sudden and wide leap downwards in the value of both dollars would be ruin; it would be a gigantic theft upon the government and upon every creditor of the government, or of individual Americans throughout the world, and would make a financial convulsion which would strew the country with bankruptcies. The other consequence of a double standard, when the relative value of silver to gold has changed, is a moral one. If the government does not readjust its two kinds of dollars by recoinage, it becomes guilty of wickedness. This is the wickedness of using itself, and enabling the citizens to use, divers and false measures in buying and selling. The function of money is to be the instrument of exchanges between commodities. In doing this the money becomes the temporary measure of value. When the government makes two kinds of dollars, one more valuable by a fourth part than the other, and by law empowers the buyer to force the meaner sort of dollars on the seller, as equal to the better sort; this is precisely as though the law should authorize cloth merchants to keep two yard-sticks, one 36 inches long, to buy with, and one 27 inches long, to sell with, and force the people to call them both full yards. In dry goods trade this would be simple rascality: why is it not the same in currency? This is the wickedness forbidden in God's law. Deut. 25: "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small." Hence it is the imperious moral duty of every government which chooses the double standard to make and to keep all its kinds of dollars of equal, and of uniform and stable value, to the best of its ability. If it does not try to do this, it is a thief and an abettor of thieving in its citizens.

I have now described the two great evils which attend the

plan of the double standard when the relative value of the metals has changed. The only honest remedy is the recoinage of all the money which the government has made out of one or the other metal. But this remedy is terribly expensive and inconvenient. I will now explain this by supposing the remedy applied to the present "Bland dollars." Let us say there are now 300,000,000 of them. First, 104 grains of pure silver has to be put into every one of these dollars to make them honest. This would require about 64,000,000 ounces of silver; which would cost at this time about \$60,000,000 in gold. Who is to pay for this? The government, of course. It has no money except by taxing the people. That is, the hard pressed tax payers must buy it. The meaning of which is that, were this false coinage raised to 100 cents values now the people must be gouged sixty millions to pay for the blunders which Congress has perpetrated under the advice of these silver men. But this is not all. All the silver coins in the use of the people must be sent back to the mints, to be made over again and made honest. This will be several months' work. In the meantime what are the people to do for silver change? What a tremendous spasm in business we shall have here! At this point some thoughtless person is going to say, "This spasm can be avoided by calling back to the mints for recoinage only small installments at one time of the silver money in the people's hands." Nay, we are not out of the woods yet! The small installments of the full-weight, new coins must be thrown into circulation as fast as they are manufactured; else this plan does nothing. But take notice: the community now has two kinds of silver money, a better and a worse; and Gresham's law immediately begins to work against the better kind. The money brokers will take out of circulation the good new dollars, nearly as fast as the mint throws them in; so the agony will be prolonged. English history tells us how powerfully this influence obstructed the new coinage at the end of the seventeenth century, in spite of the honest administration of William and Mary and the transcendent talents of the mint-master, who was no other than Sir. I. Newton.

But if these things would be done in the green tree, what would be done in the dry? Suppose that we had the free coinage of silver into Bland dollars, which many clamor for! Gold

would be driven from us in all purchases and payments just as fast as the mints could coin the silver; and when the volume of the latter became large enough to relieve the check on gold exports, operated by the stringency of a deficient currency, the last of our gold would go. Who would be fool enough to pay gold for any purchase or debt when law enabled him to gain 25 per cent. by paying in silver? Let us suppose a debtor owing \$1,000, who has provided a thousand gold dollars, or goods equal thereto, wherewith to pay; he has only to use this gold instead of letting his creditors have it, to buy silver bullion and to send it to a mint where the United States will make it into Bland dollars for him, without even charging him the slight toll of a seignorage; and he wipes off his \$1,000 debt and has \$250 silver dollars left in his pocket; of course he will do this. Of course, every other debtor will do the same. Nobody will receive any gold for any purchase or debt. It will practically cease to be American money. Thoughtless people say, let us have free coinage of silver in order to have money plenty. It is the very way to make money scarce, for it will drive away all our gold, which will not only take out \$650,000,000 of American gold now existing, but it will dry up all that vaster volume of credits now doing money's work, founded on that gold.

But the silver men claim that silver is not really depreciated in the world's commercial market. They assert that the enormous depression on its price is the wicked work of the "gold bugs" in passing the law of the single standard in 1873, and of Germany in adopting the single standard, thus forcing France to do the same. They claim that if the United States will adopt free coinage, and especially if she could persuade the European nations to return to the double standard, the event would show it, and silver would mount up again to the good old price of 16 for 1. Sound financiers know that this is all idle and false. Silver will never return to its former relative value in a century, because its decline has not been due to any legislative acts in either Europe or America, but to an enormous increase of production and partial diminution of demand. In the first place, if the United States could persuade the European nations to come back to the double standard this would not increase the general demand for silver for cir-

ulation, but rather diminish it; for I have shown that the countries of the single standard circulate much more silver per capita than the United States, which has the double standard. In the next place, the United States never will persuade the European nations to adopt our bad system of currency. Their statesmen are not such fools. Their Parliaments are not cursed with "silver lobbies," where private producers of the silver crop have their hired agents to cause the government to "bull" the price of their special crop at the expense of all other honest producers. Some of those Parliaments may have "Houses of Peers"; but they are not infested with oligarchs carrying mining camps in their pockets as their rotten boroughs under the name and pretext of sovereign States. They may send commissioners to Paris and Berlin, highly paid at the people's expense, to ventilate their sophisms before the European financiers; it will result in nothing. Such commissioners have already been sent and they were heard with civil contempt, as they deserved.\*

When we learn the simple facts as to the amazing change in the annual volume of the silver crop we see plainly enough why it has become and will remain much cheaper. New and very rich lodes of ore have been discovered like the famous Comstock mine. Chemistry has improved the methods of extracting the metal. Old mines have been reopened as railroads and industrial enterprises are extended. Twenty years ago the annual crop of the United States and territories was about nineteen millions of ounces. It is now one hundred and sixty-one millions. What else can result from this enormous increase in the crop than a marked decline in relative price? Last year the American crop of cotton increased from about seven and a quarter millions of bales to eight million and six hundred thousand. This knocks the price down from ten to eight cents per pound. Here the increase was less than one-sixth, and it made the price fall one-fifth. But the increase in the silver crop has been eight-fold, not seventeen per cent., but eight hundred per cent! "Oh, but," exclaim the silver men, "the area of commerce and civilization is rapidly increasing; and with it the demands for silver for currency and the arts."

---

\*This prophecy is fulfilled by the failure of the recent Brussels conference.

I reply, so the uses of cotton and the world's market for cotton fabrics are annually extending. Has the area of commerce been extended eight hundred per cent. in twenty years? This at least would be necessary in order to absorb the eight-fold silver crop, if the other elements of demand remain as before. But they have not. The demand for silver has relatively declined in several respects. As to the arts: There are more people now than twenty years ago who think they are rich enough to use plate on their tables instead of earthenware? Yes, but the cheap process of electrotyping has been invented and the people use a hundred times as much of these wares. Again, the methods of traffic in India, China and Japan, with their six hundred millions of industrial people, are changing, so as to employ relatively less silver and more gold, and bank credits. The Chinese and Japanese have long employed silver as their chief money of commerce. But since the opening of their ports a large part of the trade has passed into the hands of Europeans, whose money of commerce is almost exclusively gold and bank credits. When India was governed by its native princes, the uncertainty and rapacity of their exactions under the name of taxes had formed an almost universal habit among the people of annually hoarding, secreting and burying their savings in the form of silver coins. But now the British have governed India for a generation. They are conquerors; but the Hindoos have had time to learn that if masters, they are wise and systematic masters. Official abuses are sternly punished. Assessments and taxes, if heavy, are regular. The people have learned that there is no occasion to secrete or bury their riches. The silver coins, which they are able to save, need no longer be buried in the cow yard, but can be carried to the savings bank, where they will earn some interest. Thus they are returned at once into the circulation. The result of this change has been the closing of a species of gulf into which an annual stream of millions of European and Spanish-American silver used to flow, to reappear no more for a life time. (Much, indeed, never reappeared, because the secret of the hiding places died with the owners). This stream is now turned back into circulation and speedily makes its presence felt in the Western world by reason of the close commercial relations between India and Europe and America.

For these and other reasons, it is evident that the old relation of supply and demand in the silver market is permanently changed. An ounce of gold will never again be bought for less than twenty ounces of silver. The best proof of this is that the fraudulent and unwise efforts of the Congress to "bull" the silver market by its coinage laws of 1878 and 1890 have been ridiculous failures. All they effected was a small spurt in the price of silver for a few weeks. It quickly dropped to its fixed price of about a dollar per ounce (of 480 grains).<sup>\*</sup> At this rate the standard dollar of 371 grains, is really worth 78 3-8 cents. It will never be worth more. All laws of Congress that it shall be, are as futile as a law that a pound of iron shall be worth a pound of copper, or as the pope's bull against the comet.

---

<sup>\*</sup>The ounce of silver has since declined obstinately to 84 cents.

# ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE FORMER LABOR SYSTEM OF THE SOUTHERN UNITED STATES.

---

1894.

---

The future must learn chiefly from the experience of the past. There is no truth better established in science, than this: That every fact and every law may have future value from, some useful application, perhaps wholly unforeseen. The wise scientific man, therefore, carefully stores up every authentic discovery, like the experienced householder; in the confidence that it will be useful at a future day, though now apparently useless. The circumstance that this fact formerly existed in conditions not likely to be ever again exactly renewed, does by no means show it valueless. It may prove a valuable guide under new and unexpected conditions.

The labor-system of the South before A. D. 1860, is a thing of the past. Nearly a generation has lived since it was abolished. It is time that the political emotions which once associated themselves with it were quieted. This seems a suitable season, therefore, after the smoke of contest has evaporated, and yet, before the data and the witnesses for the investigation have perished, to ascertain its real economic effects.

This inquiry should be kept carefully separate from the social and the moral questions touching that system of labor. It is fully assumed, that wealth is not the only end, nor the highest end, which a commonwealth or a nation should pursue. The truth, that a given social system is the most lucrative does not prove it unjust. The single point to be pursued in this inquiry is: What really were the economic results of the system which has passed away? And this point is sought only for the light it is capable of shedding on future economic prob-



lems, which may meet our posterity. Of course, science looks only at premises and conclusions, considering only whether the former are grounded in authentic facts; and the latter are logically drawn. The inquirer has nothing to do with preconceptions and inclinations, for or against the system examined. The main premises of any valuable conclusions here, are the facts. Theories and hypotheses are of no account, in the face of the facts. The chief reliance must be upon the actual results, as revealed by the authorized statistics of labor and production. And these will be found to demonstrate, when examined from the various points of view, a cumulative proof, that the Southern labor-system was comparatively much the more productive of wealth and accumulated capital.

It may be well to define clearly in the outset, what that labor-system was, commonly known as domestic slavery of Africans. He who persists in viewing and treating it as virtually the same with the system which bore the equivalent name in pagan Greece and Rome, cannot possibly understand what the Southern system really was. It may be true that "Aristotle" (Politics) "can be quoted, defining a δούλος or slave as *χρεῖα ἐμψυχον* "an animated utensil"; or that modern assailants may declare the African in the South was made by law "a mere thing," "a chattel." But every fair observer knows that in the South, essential changes from that unjust and harsh system were made by law, which, while for convenience sake, leaving the name of slave, made the relation to the master essentially a different one. So far did the laws of the South go from treating the African in bondage as a mere thing, owned by the master absolutely; those laws treated the bondsman as a responsible moral agent, personally amenable to statute laws, and encouraged and warned by its sanctions: they protected his life, limbs, Sabbath and chastity, against violence even from his own master: and that by the same statutes, and the same penalties which protected these rights of white persons: they gave to the bondman a legal title, as against his own master's estate, and even against his master's personal earnings or professional salary, to a laboring man's subsistence for life: they enabled him, if not legally held in constraint, to sue his own master at the law, for his liberty. What then remained to the master, of the prerogatives of a master? This

only: Property in the involuntary labor of the African, for life, subject to the bondsman's right of subsistence, and such control of his person and services only as was necessary to possess that title. The Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land, and the work of the greatest jurists and statesmen of America, has cut off all debate as to how much and how little was lawfully meant by the relation, in giving us an exact definition, in words perfectly clear-cut and appropriate. These Africans were described as, "*Persons held to labor or service in any State*" (meaning: so held by regular law of that State).

So, Sir William Blackstone defined the bondage which existed in his day (notwithstanding Lord Mansfield's famous decision in the Somerset case), by law in England and all her colonies, as a title to another person's involuntary labor, which, while a title for life, was no more in its nature, than that of the master to the labor of his indentured apprentice. So Dr. Paley, in his moral and political philosophy. We have nothing to do then, with discussing the economic results of a pagan system of slavery, never known for a moment in civilized America, which dehumanized the rational human agent into a "thing a mere chattel." The system we have to examine was as a labor system; the subjection of the labor, for life, of a certain alien and savage population defined by the law, irrespective of their optional consent, to the heads of white, free families, in a domestic government of the master; but under the limits and restraints of civil law. What were the economic results of this vigorous expedient, to which the Southern States resorted in order to protect themselves from the evils of the presence of this savage population? A presence which had not been elected by those States, but forced on them, while colonies, against their choice, by the slave trading laws of England and New England. Let the reader observe in passing that nothing more is needed than this correct definition of the relation, to make an end of the boastful argument of the Abolitionist. He argues that the relation was always and essentially wicked. The only premise which can furnish even a pretence for this conclusion is the following: That any human being's property in the involuntary labor of another human must be always and essentially wicked. But when this

is dragged into the light, its falsehood at once appears both monstrous and ridiculous. The parental relation clothes the parent with property in the involuntary labor of the child. The business relation clothes the employer with property in the involuntary labor of the apprentice. The marital relation may clothe the wife with property in the involuntary labor of the husband. There is not a legitimate government on earth that does not clothe the rulers with property in the involuntary labor of the citizens. What else is the right to tax, to exact military service? Thus this heady argument, which has incited to a frightful civil war, to the murder of a million of men and to the final destruction of a free constitution, is found to be nothing but the blind pressing of a false issue. The evil thing which Abolitionism professed to attack had no existence except in its own slanderous accusations.

Another caution must be observed, in a fair examination of this question. The productiveness of a given system may be partly determined by the features of the system itself; and partly by the personal traits of the people managed under it; as the efficiency of a given army in the field depends partly on the system of arming and drill, and partly on the "personnel" and morale of the race from which the ranks are filled. Now, a labor-system, as such, should not be held responsible for the initial state of barbarity, ignorance, laziness, ineptness, and general unthrift, of the persons first delivered to it to be by it employed.

The necessity of employing such instruments as the savage Africans were, may have prejudiced the results of a better labor-system in a comparison with some worse system, which has the good fortune to employ civilized, efficient, trained labor at the outset. And if the former, in spite of this disadvantage, yet produce large results, while it improved the labor and morale of its sorry instruments: this would be, to the thoughtful mind, the most splendid evidence of its efficiency as a system.

A very slight acquaintance with the science of economics teaches, that little can be learned by a general and cursory view of societies and comparison of their aspects. Yet many have argued that the Southern labor-system must be economically bad, because they found more of the surface appearances of

wealth, in the Europe and America of the nineteenth century, as large cities, splendid mansions, lavish expenditures, and princely incomes, in hireling societies than in slaveholding; more in England than in Jamaica; or more in New York than in Virginia. But several facts must be remembered: of which one is: That in modern times, the slave-holding societies, in every case, had been made, in one way or another, industrially tributary to the hireling. The West-Indian and South American settlements were colonies to Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, or Holland; and their industries were by law subjected to restrictive systems, designed to transfer a large part of their earnings to the home traders. The Southern States, between the end of the revolutionary war and 1789, the admitted leaders in wealth and progress, no sooner entered the Federal Union, than their industries also were made tributary, by bounty, navigation, tariff, and financial enactments of Congress, to their hireling-labor partners. Thus, there has been no example, not injuriously meddled with, by which it could be shown how profitable the Southern system would be when it had a fair chance? It can never be determined which of two hives of bees is most productive in honey-making while the bees of one hive are regularly empowered to rifle every returning worker of the other hive, of a part of his sweets. Both the tendencies of the hireling communities in America, and of the Federal policy towards those States, were more favorable than the Southern system to gathering a larger portion of their people into towns. But any populous town, whatever the goodness or badness of its labor-system, tends to stimulate ornamental agriculture around its suburbs. One only of the influences need be mentioned. Most Americans, when enriched by traffic, vehemently desire the amusements and boast of an ornamented, suburban farm, or villa. The products of these, evoked by lavish outlay of labor and manure, never equal their cost. Probably every ton of hay from the model farm has cost the price of a ton and a half to produce it; every boasted pound of golden butter has cost two pounds. But now, while these lavish toys of "merchant princes" spread a pleasing zone of culture and apparent fertility around each pompous city, they are in no sense productive industry: no more so than the lemons which the lady-wives have ripened in their conservatories, at

the cost of a dollar for each lemon, worth half a dime. The more any society has of these toy-farms, the more is its aggregate wealth wasted. If the admiring tourist would go to the more retired parts of the regions tributary to this city, he would soon see, in the "nakedness of the land," or in the hardships of its poor, the proof of that proposition. But as it is, the European observes, landing at Boston, and journeying thence to Marblehead, to New Providence, to New Haven, to New York, to Newark, to New Brunswick, to Elizabeth, to Trenton, to Philadelphia, to Chester, to Wilmington (Delaware), scarcely gets out of one artificial suburban or zone, until he enters another. He leaps to the conclusion, that these hireling States are all in a state of splendid prosperity. Should he then continue his journey past Baltimore, to Washington, to Richmond, and the farther Southern States, the Atlantic border so expands itself in its geographical configuration, instead of the crowded convexity of the region he has passed over, and the cities are so few and small, that the bare spaces of the unadorned continent appear largely. Each Southern city has also its zone of fictitious wealth; but they are far apart: the eye of the unfriendly tourist prefers to rest on the poorer inter-spaces: he convinces himself that these States are poor. He has taken but a partial, and therefore a deceptive, view.

Nobody can be blind to the natural differences made by the Creator, between favored and slighted districts, as to natural soil and climate. Let the alluvial plain of Lombardy be compared with the bleak sand and pine barrens of old Brandenburg: Is there on earth a tougher, more hardy, diligent, saving peasantry than that of Brandenburg, and is not their farming guided by the best science in Europe? But all this can only keep alive on that hungry soil, under that harsh climate, a starveling appearance of tillage, which is pitiful beside the smiling abundance of the Po alluvium. Here are natural disadvantages, which no virtue of any labor-system can equalize or compensate. Now, it has been said a thousand times: that the old Atlantic slave States had a great advantage in the native fertility of their soils; but that these fat fields have been skinned and impoverished by the bad system of labor. Both parts of this statement have always been simply false. The lands which, in Virginia and the Carolinas, showed poverty in

1860, had always been poor. They had never been made poor, but were born poor. The uplands of the old Atlantic watershed, which are the vastly larger part of that area, are naturally thin and barren at their Northern, and their Southern ends. They were poor in New England. The part embraced in the old Middle States, from the Hudson to the Potomac, were naturally the best. In Virginia they began to deteriorate, and the natural average became worse and worse, as they approached the Gulf. Florida being the poorest of all. In the one great Illinois bottom opposite St. Louis and Southern Missouri, there is more fertile mould than nature ever gave to all Eastern Virginia, or either Carolina. When the really rich virgin soils of the great Mississippi valley were opened to cultivation, the new States had an advantage for production and the accumulation of capital, which statistics can hardly express. How ought that industry, which yields fifty or sixty bushels of maize per acre, without manure, to outrun that which, with the same labor of cultivation, yields, without manure, ten bushels? Such was and is the virgin strength of the larger part of the upland area of the old Southern States. So far as any criterion could be found, of the relative advantage of the Southern System, from observing the face of the country, the simple facts were, in 1860, these: The African labor was holding its place as the preferable labor, in every district of every Southern State where it had ever had foothold, besides extensive and profitable emigration to new regions. It was steadily making its way into those fertile parts of the Southern States once tilled by white, hireling labor; because found practically more profitable. The whole area of the old South was in a rapid and splendid state of reparation and improvement: even the thin land described, which never had any fertility to lose, coming rapidly up to profitable tillage. And the few bands and islets of really strong land presented, in 1860, the most magnificent tillage and the largest crops seen in any of the old States.

Let it be distinctly understood, that these general views are not advanced as the conclusive proofs of the good results of the system. That proof will be given below, in the authentic testimony of the government itself, and in solid facts officially attested. The objects of the above views are simply

preliminary: to clear away from the reader's mind presumptive impressions against the truth: to rebut by more accurate and impartial views, the prejudices excited against the witness we are about to introduce, through false first impressions. One of these impressions, much relied on, is the appearance of extensive exhausted fields in the South. It has been unhesitatingly claimed that slavery was the cause; that an exhausting cultivation is the proof of its bad economic effect. The one answer has been already given: that many of these lands could not justly be said to be exhausted by any cause, inasmuch, they were naturally so poor as to have almost no fertility to lose. But there were districts in the South which, before the splendid recuperation of 1845-1860, effectuated under slave labor, had been in an exhausted condition.

Now if the same result be found in several other districts where slavery never existed, the argument is ruined. The same result has, in fact, been found in every district of America, where these two circumstances concurred; the possession of a profitable staple saleable in large quantities, and sufficient proximity to market. In any country, and under every system of labor, if new land is cheaply accessible, this result follows (see John Stewart Mill. Political Economy. Book I, chapter 12). The profitable staple tempts the first generation of land-owners to exhausting cultivation. They suppose that it is more gainful to exhaust the land, and take up other fields new and cheap, than to manure the old. This cause has regularly produced exhaustion in the hireling States, as in the South. Thus ninety years ago, New England farmers went to the calcareous lands of Vermont to raise wheat. They pressed their gainful staple, but exhausted their soil. To-day those old wheat farms are sheep pastures, and the shepherds scarcely raise their own flour. Fifty years ago the second generation of these Vermont wheat growers emigrated from their exhausted farms to the Genesee country of West New York to raise wheat. They reaped forty bushels per acre, from the virgin soil; but they pressed the skinning process, until the average product fell below twelve bushels per acre. Then the next generation went to Ohio, and skinned the apparently exhaustless lands of that State, the boast of this school of economists: until the remorseless truthfulness of census-returns showed,

that Ohio was yielding an average of only eight and a half bushels. And now the fourth generation are skinning the fat prairies of Iowa and Nebraska. Another argument has been claimed from the recuperation of production within the last twenty years in the subjugated States. The exclamation is: Behold here, what the South gains by getting rid of her bad economic system of labor. Some Southerners even, have been shallow enough to echo it; because, poor fellows, they had been so accustomed, for the first fifteen years of their subjugation, to desperate poverty and hopelessly unremunerated effort, that any degree of increase looks splendid in their eyes: blinded to the past by the tears of despair. The latter, partial return of progress in production is, indeed, a magnificent testimony to the temper and pluck of the ex-slaveholders: in that under a system so adverse as the present they could ever restore any progress at all. But we meet with a flat denial, the assertion that industrial progress, and the growth of new capital now presents any such comparative ratio to that of the old system, as to prove the supposed point. Between 1840 and 1860, Virginia, an old State pursuing mainly other staples than wheat, increased her wheat crop from ten to thirteen million bushels, and her tobacco from fifty-six to one hundred and twenty-four millions of pounds! This progress was under her old system of labor. Her wheat and tobacco crops up to 1880, under the new system, were restored only to: wheat, 7,826,174 bushels, and tobacco, 79,988,868 pounds. Only one other fact is necessary. Between 1850 and 1860 the cotton crop, peculiarly and exclusively the product of the Southern system, grew from two and a half million bales, to five and a half millions: an increase of 110 per cent. in ten years. Let it now be remembered that in 1860 the cotton raising States had but seven and a half millions of people. Now they have about seventeen millions.

But since 1860, thirty years ago, this larger population, under hireling labor, has only raised the crop of 1894 to ten million bales. A phenomenal crop? Here is progress: progress gratifying to a conquered and despoiled people: but it is a sorry showing as compared with that of the old system. Leaving out the years of the war, a similar ratio of progress would have given us in 1894 fifty-two millions of bales instead of the



actual ten million. This calculation, of course, discounts the repressive power of an overstocked market. No economist claims for the statistics of a census, entire accuracy. But it is presumable that omissions and inaccuracies virtually balance each other, when a comparative view is carefully deduced between two sections. If, for instance, our appraisement of the cash value of a given product which is reported in bushels or tons, should be somewhat too low, or too high, no comparative error results, because that product in both sections has been appraised at the same price: so that the one section gains or loses by any possible error of price, precisely in proportion to the other. But in all important particulars, the advantage in the following estimates has been intentionally given to the hireling States. The two following instances will explain this. The wheat crops are given in bushels. It is well known to merchants, that the average price of a bushel of Southern wheat was considerably more, in any year, than of the Northwestern wheat, which furnishes always the main bulk of that crop in the hireling States: because it comes into an earlier market, because it is more flinty and mature, and thus makes a flour worth often half as much again for export, and because the Southern crop includes no spring wheat; always inferior to the winter wheat. Yet, in estimating the value of wheat, both in 1850 and 1860, the same price was allowed for all Northern, as for Southern wheat. Thus the advantage of many millions of dollars was allowed to the hireling system. The other instance is our unquestioning acceptance of the census-estimates of personal property at the North.

The nature of Northern pursuits has unquestionably produced a vastly larger development of that class of so-called values, known as credits, or securities, at the North, than at the South. These credits are named as personal property: are subject to taxation and are always counted by men in estimating their wealth. They are, of course, listed as personal property by the census, and by the tax assessor, except that enormous fortune concealed by fraud.

But many of them are not values. When the capital stock of a railroad, which actually expended ten millions in its plant, is swelled by "watering" to twenty millions, however these fictitious shares may sell, or may pay dividends, they represent

no real values: they are only an artifice for levying a gratuitous lien, and exacting a robber tax on all the real industry which seeks transportation on the road. When an owner of real estate sells land on credit and takes the purchaser's bond no value is created by that transaction. Was the land worth ten thousand dollars? There is now the land, taxable in the purchaser's hands at ten thousand dollars of value: and there is the bond, taxable in the vendor's hands, as another ten thousand. Each man counts the amount. The tax-assessor counts it twice; but not a dollar of value exists, as yet, beyond the ten thousand. Those who argue the reality of the fictitious, credit value, ask: Is this bond worth nothing to the holder? Cannot it be sold at par, if secured by mortgage on the land? Sued for? Bequeathed? Surely it is a real value! But the stubborn answer is: Whence has any real value been created? The land, the only original value, is now in the purchaser's hand: and clearly value can not be created by exchanging a piece of paper. The explanation which these economists overlook is very simple. There are rights, which may grow into values only. But rights may be sold, bequeathed, held by law. When a great commercial crash comes, like that of 1873, this species of wealth vanishes by hundreds of millions. How is this? There is no way in which actual values have been used or consumed, no fire, flood, shipwreck, war, exportation, devouring of anything. Literally no process of consumption of values known to political economy has taken place; but suddenly thousands of people are poorer by millions. The explanation is, that the credits destroyed by the "panic" never had been actual, but only potential values. They never actually existed as values: no value has been actually destroyed. The only diminution of real values or wealth which the panic has caused is the depreciation of prices of such possessions as are real commodities.

Now, in the appraisement of values, it is notorious that the lists of the hireling States contained many more hundreds of millions of credits than those of the Southern States. These States were mainly agricultural; their trading towns were relatively few and small; and the species of "business" so-called, and speculations, by which these credits are nominally inflated, were comparatively unknown among them up to 1860. But

we have made no deduction against the hireling States on this ground: a large advantage has been allowed them in the comparison. Before 1850, the census returns had scarcely been taken on so comprehensive, or digested on so scientific a scale, as to make their testimony decisive. After 1860 the Southern system no more had any existence during a census year. Hence our comparisons are justly limited to the years 1850 and 1860: and these are enough. The testimony of the government itself, then is as follows.

In 1850 the total appraised values of the Southern States were \$2,900,604,589 to 9,348,924 total population; subtracting 3,204,313 slaves: 6,143,924 whites. If this aggregate were divided among the whites per capita, it would give possessions averaging \$472 per head to the whites. Or if it be insisted that the negroes shall be counted among the population, we had \$310 per head for white and black. Or, else: if we yield to (unfair) assertion that, in this comparison, the property in the labor of slaves shall not count for anything: we then deduct the whole, appraising all, men, women, children, and decrepit at \$250 per head, which is a high estimate for 1850; and we have left a property of \$355 per soul for each Southerner. In 1850 the hireling States had thirteen and a half millions of souls, and the appraised possessions of all kinds were \$3,621,011,661. Each soul then had an average of \$270. This gives the superior riches to the South, by \$85 per head, if we strip the Southerners of all property in the labor of the Africans; although hundreds of millions of dollars of actually realized and paid up capital had been paid by them for that species of property. If the Africans are counted as property, then the average Southerner was richer by \$202. In 1860 the South had twelve millions of people, including not quite four millions of Africans. Her appraised values were \$6,746,343,761, an increase of more than double in ten years. The hireling States with eighteen and four-fifths millions of souls, presented a total of \$9,257,964,000. The North had received from foreign emigrations an annual accession of several hundred thousand people more than the South, estimated to have brought them, besides their persons and labor, an average of \$1,000 each in cash. Still the relative major wealth was with the South; each white soul having \$831, as against \$490 to each soul in the North. Or,

if the unfair deductions be insisted on, of all property in the labor of the Africans, each Southerner still had \$637, as against the Northern average of \$490 per head. And the deduction is here made at the liberal rate of \$400 for each soul of the Africans, their market value having risen in ten years. Or, if the division of the Southern total be made between the whole population, including all the Africans, there was still an average of \$560 per head, against \$490 at the North.

Or, let another view be inspected. In 1860 the hireling States reared of the cereals used by Americans as human food, five hundred and sixty-one millions of bushels, and the Southern States four hundred and ninety-four millions. That is, the hireling system gave each of its souls about thirty bushels; but the Southern system gave each of its souls forty-one bushels. Moreover, the hireling States boasted in these cereals as their great export crops. But the South, after feeding every one of her souls one-fourth more liberally than the hireling States, must have had proportional surplus for export, besides her magnificent totals of cotton and tobacco! Again, of the domestic animals used by Americans as human food (horned cattle, sheep and swine) the hireling States had in 1860 about forty millions, or a little more than two per soul for each inhabitant: While the South had forty and a half millions, or about three and a half for each inhabitant. But, as the flesh of swine is so predominant in the food of laboring Americans, it will be interesting to see the proportions here. The hireling States had not quite twelve millions of swine; while the South had twenty millions six hundred thousand. The hireling system gave each mouth a little more than six-tenths of one swine per annum; while the Southern system gave each mouth one whole swine and seven-tenths of a second. But this does not tell the whole story. A part of the hireling States were very large exporters of pork. Sundry of the Southern States were, on the contrary, large importers: and none of them sent away any appreciable export of it. So that the laboring people of the hireling States must have been deprived by export of quite a large portion of their scanty six-tenths of swine per mouth; and the Southern laborer must have eaten that portion, and all his one and seven-tenths besides. Yet the cry was: The African was wronged by being scantily fed! Again, in 1860, the South, with

a little more than twelve millions of people, had 3,891,795 horses, asses and mules. The hireling States, with not quite nineteen millions of people, had 4,335,246. Once more: the annual earnings of the hireling States, including all the branches of agriculture, mining and manufactures, and the whole value of live stock were \$98.67 per head for the whole population in 1850. The same year, the same industries in the South yielded an increase \$108.25 for every soul, including the Africans. In 1860, the earnings of the hireling States amounted to only \$101.44 for each soul; but in the South, to \$111.35 for every soul, including the Africans. When we multiply this difference of about 10 per cent. in 1850 and of 16 per cent. in 1860 by the twelve millions of the Southern people, it makes a huge difference in the proportional profits, in favor of the Southern system. The returns of 1860 also disclose another fact: that successful manufacturing industries were at that time, by no means confined to the hireling States. It is true, that the South was prevalently agricultural: not because its civilization, or its labor system was ruder, but because its tastes and interests drew it by an enlightened influence, in that direction. That its agricultural preference was enlightened is demonstrated by the grand fact, testified by the government itself: that its profits were larger than those of the other States working on a system more largely manufacturing.

The South knew what it was about. Yet, there was a very large development of successful manufacturing industry, of which the rest of the world was strongly unobservant. Some times, the instances of this were amusing. In 1864 a "raid" of a cavalry detachment into Virginia resulted in the sack of two or three iron-smelting establishments in her upper counties. A metropolitan journal in New York thereupon congratulated Mr. Lincoln at this vital reduction of the iron resources of the Confederate government at Richmond, informing the world that Virginia in 1860 had had six furnaces in operation: of whose resources one-third was now extinguished. In fact, the one county of Rockbridge in 1860 had more than 12, and the adjoining county of Alleghany as many! In 1862, General T. J. Jackson learned that the Confederate war department was debating the policy of so contracting its lines of defense in upper Virginia, as to leave out the lower Shenandoah "Valley."

He requested the Congressman, representing the district in Richmond, to protest. This gentleman said to the administration: "Consider what, in such a contraction, you abandon. For instance, among other resources, you abandon, in my congressional district alone, fourteen woolen factories, which produce clothing and blankets for your army." But the general returns of the Federal government itself are more valuable. They say that in 1860, the South produced by manufacturing, values, after deducting the cost of raw materials, to the amount of about one hundred and eighteen millions. The hiring States produced in the same way, something more than five hundred and thirty-six millions. The latter had \$28.21 of this sort of values; the South \$9.64, more than one-third as much.

Probably, if the question had been asked in 1860, or last week, of the "well informed" Northern man or European: "In what ratio do you suppose the manufacturing industry of the great North exceeded that of the South?" his guess would have been: "In the ratio of fifty to one." The boast sounds of that largeness.

The bearing of these attested facts on our argument is not seen until we consider how the legitimated accumulations of Southern industry were systematically transferred to the North, after they were earned, by the legislative system of the Federal government. This levying of commercial tribute on our industry began almost as soon as the government. Washington's first administration had not ended, before Congress had assumed a power, of which the makers of the Constitution were not dreaming: to incorporate in the territory of State, a mammoth bank of circulation and discount, which it made its exclusive fiscal agent. Thus, at one unforeseen touch, the advantage of disbursements and credits founded on the privilege of handling the assets of the treasury taken by taxation from all the people, was taken from the South, the payer of the larger taxes, and given to the North. Then under the pretext of fostering a seafaring class for the advantage of the Federal navy, a fishing bounty was established: the whole of which from the foreseen force of circumstances, went to the North. For many years before 1860 this bounty had taken out of the people's taxes a million and a half annually. Half of this was a simple transfer

of the Southern earnings into Northern pockets. The next burden was the enactment of a navigation law: precluding all foreign shipping from the coast-carrying trade. It did not suit the tastes and interests of the Southern people to go largely into shipbuilding: as was foreseen and intended, the lion's share of the gains of this monopoly went out of Southern pockets into Northern. The great bulk of the commodities to be transported were, up to 1860, of Southern production: the beneficiaries of the monopoly of transportation were Northern.

If one is curious to know the scale on which Southern production has been taxed by this monopoly, for nearly a hundred years, he has only to look into the commercial news of the port of Galveston. He there sees, every day, freights on Southern commodities to Europe from which the navigation laws do not exclude this competition taken by the European ships for just half the price charged by Northern ships coastwise, where they are armed with this monopoly—that is to say: On every product of her industry, which the South desires to send by water to another American market, she has paid (chiefly to Northern ships) two freight charges where one was due.

The next method of depleting our industry was by the more liberal dispensation of pensions, and moneys for light-houses, custom-houses, and other Federal buildings, in the North. It mattered little whether the rolls of Washington's army in the field showed an equal number of Virginians and Carolinian men: at the pension office the Northern revolutionary veterans always had a grand majority. The edifices built with taxés, from which the vicinage always manages so pretty a profit, were plentifully sprinkled Northward: sparce and humble Southward.

But the gigantic method of transfer of Southern earnings into Northern pockets is, of course, the protective system, dating, in its onerous degrees, from about 1820. Every economist admits the inevitable effect of protective tariffs, to transfer from the consumer to the manufacturer, a second profit, in addition to the one fairly attached to the production, at least equal to the tariff on the commodity. This needs no argument. If the protected producer does not actually realize this plunder from his fellow-citizens, it is only because this consumer is wronged in this other form, viz: by being forced to buy what

he needs from a man not qualified to produce it as cheaply as it might have been produced elsewhere. One of the confident arguments of protectionists is: That the system benefits not only the protected manufacturer, but all the neighboring industries around him, by diffusing capital and opening markets for their products. If this is so, then the North has gained, in the race of comparative acquisition, gained without earning it even more than the vast aggregate of additional profits paid on protected manufactures, consumed in the South. Or, if an attempt be made to estimate the amount of our losses from another point of view, when we ask: Why does the American producer demand protection? His answer is: because without it he can make no profit in the face of European competitors. If this is just, then it follows, that whatever gains these protected producers now have, were taken without value received from consumers! From Southern consumers in that proportion in which they bought their products. Thus, the riches transferred out of Southern earnings into Northern hands, between 1820 and 1860, are seen to be almost beyond computation. But even this did not measure fairly the losses unjustly imposed on Southern industry by the protective system. Like a hasty and reckless forager in an enemy's country, it destroyed far more than the plunder it carried away. It happened that the South had, up to 1860, two staples especially of vital importance to her, tobacco and cotton, of which vastly the larger parts must be sold abroad, or have no purchasers because the volume of their production was manifold what the United States needed, or could buy. For instance, in 1860 the single county of Halifax, Va., and Casewill, N. C., were producing enough leaf tobacco to supply the consumption of the whole manufacturing population of the United States. Even of the 5,500,000 bales of cotton made that year, the United States were able to use only 910,090 bales: less than one-sixth. Now, if a (See comp. of C. p. 180,) the South was to get a living price for the rest of these grand staples, foreign nations must buy them. If foreign nations bought, they must pay in merchandizes useful in the Southern States, for international exchange must be barter.

For instance: England said to the South, in substance: "We desire your cotton; if we pay for it in our excellent woollens



and iron-mongery, which we offer cheap, and you need, we will buy all your cotton at a good price." But the tariff steps in and says: "No; England shall not pay in woollens and iron"; except under such disadvantages as must vastly reduce the quantity exchanged and the advantage of the exchange. Then England must say, however reluctantly: "Therefore we can take much less cotton, or at a much lower price." Thus the South lost twice; once in this cruel reduction of the selling price of her own products; and again in the tribute paid, without value received, to the North.

Evidently, the Southern system might have been far more productive of values than the rival system, and yet, under this relentless drain, her aggregate of values might have been far smaller. That she could spare this enormous drain, receiving no countervailing commercial advantage, and still outrun her gigantic rival, at successive decenniums, is an evidence of the economic vigor of her system and her people, inexpressibly splendid.

With this overwhelming and reiterated testimony of the government itself, and of the facts, to the superior profits of the Southern system, the debate might end. But if it stopped with a sweeping victory here, the more instructive part of this history of the past would be missed. We propose to show by what principles of true economic science this result was attained: so contrary to the prognostics of the more favored assertors of the science itself.

It is this part of the discussion, which will furnish the valuable corrections and additions to our science, for the untried future. The leading writers of France, Great Britain and New England, including the latest and perhaps ablest (Frederic Bastiat), have usually followed Adam Smith, in demonstrating the unprofitableness of slave labor, from premises given chiefly by fancy and slander. It should have given them pause at least in their application of their passionate declarations, to our Southern system, to remember that most of them had never been in three thousand miles of our country: and that none of them had any personal knowledge of the real character of the Southern people, or of the Africans.

The stock arguments are such as these: "That our system made the masters lazy: That the slave will slight his work as

much as he dares, having no incentive to diligence but fear; while the free peasant proprietor, incited by self-interest, will work to the best advantage: That the methods of labor will be wasteful: That the proprietors, not having expended their own labor for the products, will administer them wastefully: That travelers testify: one intelligent free laborer did the work of two slaves," etc.

Mr. Mills, in his discussion of communism, for which his intense political radicalism gave him quite a fellow feeling, has powerfully refuted his own passionate arguments against the bad economy of slave labor. No better defense of its good economic effects need be desired, than the passages in book 2 ch. 1. where, after perforce admitting that the labor of communists must be compulsory, he yet argues that it would be the most efficient of all.

What application these arguments may have had to the serfs of Russia and Hungary, to the slaves of Brazil and the British West Indies, we do not pretend to know. But we do know that they lack application, in a single point, to our Southern system. When African servants were poor savages, inept, alien, knowing no words of English, and moreover stiffened and enfeebled by the horrors of the "middle passage," very possibly they did only half a freeman's work. It is not unusual that a maxim which had a basis of truth at the beginning, may be repeated by inaccurate observers, long after that basis is removed. Certain it is that in the 19th century, after civilization, discipline, good feeding, intelligent tuition, and constant domestic intercourse with the most spirited and cultivated of the white races, the Africans had wholly changed.

In 1860, as they were the best fed and clothed, so they were the most athletic, the most skilled, the most effective and the most cheerful agricultural laborers in the world. Nothing is said here of the multitudes of skilled artisans among them, as smiths, masons, plasterers, carpenters, machinists, horse-fanciers, sugar-refiners, stone-cutters, quarrymen. The industry of our system was prominently agricultural; we speak mainly of the agricultural labor. We do not ask the reader to accept this testimony upon the word of the writer, who after being reared among these African laborers, had opportunity personally to compare their efficiency with that of free laborers in

Great Britain, Germany and the North. But it is fortified by a number of solid facts, which no one acquainted with the South will hazard his credit by disputing.

In 1860, the census itself told us, what Northern statesmen had to admit: that the lands immediately South of the dividing line, in Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, were rated at least one-fifth higher than lands of the same soil and climate in Pennsylvania and Ohio, immediately North of the line, tilled by free, or hiring labor.

The great "Valley of Virginia" was settled by the Scotch-Irish peasantry. But, while at first a free labor district, with almost no Africans, its inclusion under the Virginia State government of course opened it to the Southern system. The white, hiring labor was, and is, the best, the most moral, and the most efficient free labor in America. But from 1840 to 1860 the African labor was introduced steadily and progressively, in preference to it. This was usually done by the most progressive, skilled and successful land-owners; and almost invariably the neighborhoods of highest agriculture were those in which this change had gone farthest. The original sentiment of the "Valley" people had been more favorable to free, or hiring labor.

Although the major part of the immigration into America went northward, the South received quite an appreciable share of it. Some German, more New England, and still more Irish laborers entered the South, and attempted every other imaginable line of industry. But it was a notable fact, that they never anywhere entered into competition with the Africans for farm labor. But the demand for more farm labor was continually increasing, with the growing prosperity and capital of the country.

The immigrants saw that they simply could not keep pace with the bondsmen. Between 1850 and 1860 there was a gigantic extension, in the South, of railroads and other internal improvements. Multitudes of experienced Northern contractors sought the country, to share in the profits of these works. They usually brought white hiring labor with them. But the Southern contractors on neighboring sections uniformly executed their contracts with African labor, more quietly, more thoroughly, and more economically. Northern engineers superin-

tending the works soon saw and acknowledged the fact. Northern contractors either replaced their white hireling labor by Africans, or they transferred their contracts to Southern contractors and retired. Such was the regular tendency, not uniformly carried out, because so many grand works were in progress, that all the available Africans found employment, and many whites besides. But it came to be the current and well known answer among successful railroad men to the question, "Can he make a profit on that contract?" "Yes, provided he gets black labor."

The sudden and violent emancipation undoubtedly depreciated the black labor, and that seriously. Every land holder felt it. Not a few former slave holders, still in bondage to the dogmatism of hireling labor assertion, when they were robbed of their black labor, comforted themselves (or affected to comfort themselves) with the profession: "Oh, well; they may be more profitable as hirelings than as bondsmen." One or two years farming invariably undeceived them. The terrible losses incurred by the deterioration of freedmen's labor then begat an intense desire to substitute for it some other hireling labor. Multitudes of experiments were made. Landholders reach out every whither for other labor. They imported Swedes, Dutchmen, Norwegians, French, and, of course, Irish. They even borrowed from California some of her Chinese. But the invariable conclusion was, that while the freedmen's labor was impaired, all these were yet worse. The African, much deteriorated from his efficiency, still remained the best labor, and to-day all over the former slave-holding districts, if hireling labor is used at all it is mainly that of blacks. The African has again occupied the labor market so far as any labor market remains on the farms, and the landlords who do not get on without labor, have to adjust their outlay, and their hopes of profit to the stingier scale of this impaired labor: it is better than any other accessible.

In order to infuse a particle of argument into the remark that a slave who has no higher motive than fear of the lash, will slight his work more than the peasant proprietor; it must be shown that the modern hireling system has a tendency to increase the number of intelligent peasant proprietors tilling their own acres with their own hands, and that the Southern

system tended to extinguish them. The facts are notoriously the opposite. The material civilization of hireling nations demands constantly, the consolidation of smaller holdings into larger, the combination of more labor in one enterprise, and the application of larger capital, in order to cheapen production.

One has only to look at Great Britain: Throughout the South, there was a large and growing class of thrifty yeomen farmers, who, while slaveholders, labored regularly with their slaves. This class did more really verify that pleasing picture of labor done from enlightened self-interest; because the one or two blacks "keeping row about" with their master and his sturdy sons, were carried forward by example, affection and emulation, and not by the lash. But since the tendency of the hireling system is to have even more of the labor done by mere hirelings, than was ever done at the South by slaves; it is enough to ask the practical man: Can not a mere hireling be a time server? Cannot he also cheat his employer of the due task? Is the fear of losing the shilling any higher motive than the fear of the lash?

As to the universal plague and curse of inefficiency in hireling labor, let Mr. John Stuart Mill's melancholy testimony be heard. Speaking of the heavy losses experienced by the hireling societies of Europe through the low moral tone of the laborers, he sighs thus: Book I. ch. 9, p. 173: "All who have ever employed hired labor have had ample experience of the efforts made to give as little labor in exchange for the wages, as is compatible with not being turned off. There is universal neglect by domestic servants of their employers' interests—unless where long continuance in the same service and reciprocal good offices have produced personal attachment." And this is exactly what the Southern system did. "Friendly relations and community of interests and feelings between laborers and employers are eminently so" (conducive to profit). "I should rather say: would be so, for I know not where any such sentiment of friendly alliance now exists." (We add the emphasis of the *italics*," Bk. I. Ch. 12, p. 234.)

Had Mr. Mill allowed himself to look at the Southern labor system with eyes unclouded by prejudice, he would have seen precisely this relationship between laborers and employers, which he sighs for as the hopeless ideal.

The adult hondsman usually felt as much pride and zeal for the success of the year; for the cleanest fields; for the finest sample of cotton or tobacco, or the highest price, as the master; often more. In their comparisons of the farms with each other, the speakers belonging to different masters, it was always: "Our crop"; "our prices"; "our victory" in the race for the largest return. The reproach of a crop in the grass was their personal humiliation. The loss of grain by a freshet, or of cattle by disaster, was always their loss. Often and often, in the former contingency, were the negroes seen far more zealous to rescue the precious harvest from the rising waters than the master: so that he would be heard recalling them with entreaties and commands, against their protests, from farther risk of health or life. Of course all this sounds very strange to a mind deluged with imaginary tales of plantation despotism. But all is credible to any intelligent man, who remembers how certainly the warm tie of clanship and feudal allegiance sprang up, between all wholesome natures brought into the domestic relation of superior and inferior. In the 16th century, the power of the Highland Chief in Scotland, over his "gilly," was practically all that a master's could be over a serf: as truly for life, as unrestrained, as complete. But every clansman to the lowest "gilly" was inflamed with the pride and zeal of his clan; he impersonated it in his Chief; he stood ready to die for him.

He who would understand the Southern system must also give the adult hondsman credit for a grade of intelligence, vastly higher than the scanty use he made of letters would imply.

It must be remembered, that this black man has grown up in domestic intimacy and friendship with his master, a member of the most cultured race in Christendom. The black man has heard and joined in his conversation. He has heard the preaching of his master's pastor. In sickness he has been instructed and treated by his scientific physician. He has been taught at least the practical part (often the theoretic) of that skillful and enlightened method of agriculture, in which he is occupied, and of the constant use of the best mechanical appliances in the world. He has been the intimate and interested spectator of a large and sagacious domestic economy. To suppose that such a hondsman does not comprehend his own and his family's interest in the plantation would be a blunder much more stupid than Africans usually make.

No; he comprehends perfectly, that this plantation is virtually a joint stock enterprise under the master's presidency. That as he has received from it his nurture in boyhood; so he is now indebted to it for certain employment, subsistence and home: That it assumes for him the certain and comfortable support of his wife and children, whether sickness, or drought, or freshet or hail come or no: That it is the safe savings bank, into which he is now annually putting the fund, which is unfailing to support him in his old age, "sitting under his own vine and fig tree," without labor or care: That the insolvency of the enterprise, through the laborers' fault would be the dreaded loss of all these hoarded advantages, and would imply risk of separations, impoverishment, and banishment from his hereditary home. The intelligent black well understood all this. Hence, the plantation usually displayed as the result of loyal affection, and reasonable self-interest the nearest approach seen under any modern system, to Mr. Mill's ideal relation of labor. There was no hireling labor on earth, requiring so little of the expense of supervision; no laborers who executed so much labor with so little of the eye of master, overseer, or "boss" upon them.

The remarks thus far made have been directed chiefly to obviating errors and objections; we advance to more positive arguments. The first is:

1. One exceedingly simple, though surprisingly overlooked. Let there be two societies, in each of which there is a body of people without capital, who should therefore be workers, and who must be consumers, and of equal numbers. In the one society, there is no positive authority to make any of this body work, who do not choose. The consequence is, that one-third of them do not choose, work none, and live by preying on the fruits of others' labor. But the two-thirds being freely moved thereto: we may suppose work very well. In the other society, there is a firm practical authority, which compels every one to work six days in every week. They may not work quite so well as the voluntary workers in the other society—we may concede merely for argument's sake—yet, as there are three to two, a good deal more is done; a good many more values are produced, and, above all, the society is delivered from the consuming pest of the idlers, and all the vices, disorders, and interruptions sug-

gested by idleness. Such was the literal difference between the Southern system and its rival.

The former had, in its laboring class, no able-bodied idlers, no "tramps," no "boys," no strong men wasting their strength on "hurdy gurdies" and dancing monkeys; no such thing as a "criminal class," and very few criminals. The economic advantage is too plain to dispute.

2. The expense of dealing with, and providing for the pauper and criminal classes is a dead charge on the production of the society. In a hireling society, it is relatively a very onerous one. The subsistence of paupers, at public, instead of private expense, implies the additional cost of buildings, officials to be salaried, and the waste and speculation commonly attending public administration. As to the "dangerous classes," they must be watched by a costly, and most often, an inefficient police. Then there must be well paid sheriffs to arrest them, palatial jails to secure them, salaried judges to try them, all the apparatus of a costly legal profession to prosecute and defend them and at last, enormous and expensive penitentiaries to punish them in, at the cost of the honest workers. Look now, at the simplicity and economy of the Southern system.

There were almost no white paupers: and there could not be in a whole State, a single black one. The infirm were cared for by the masters, on the plantations, with no additional charge for lodging, nursing, or attending. This reduced the cost of the charity to that of simple food, clothing and medicine.

• There was no criminal class, and consequently, not one dollar of cost for police. The plantation policed itself. Felonies prosecuted before the courts of the country were very few; and justice was administered by the master himself, for all those minor offenses (which in hireling societies require so expensive an apparatus of police, courts, lawyers, costs, prisons) without one cent of charge, without officials, without any prison or court house, without the loss of a day's labor by the culprit. His offense was simply examined by his master, almost invariably a judicious and moderate judge; he was either cleared, scolded, or switched; and went at once back to his work.

No word is needed to show how favorable the morality of a population is to production. The Southern system not only reduced to the minimum cost the prosecution of such law



breakers as she had, but astonishingly reduced their numbers, by improving the practical morality of her people. The Southern system was the most effective temperance society in the world. The regular supervision and methodical employment removed the laborers from temptation; and in the few cases of intoxication, a smart application of the birch was a better recipe to produce immediate relief, than all the materia medica. It is probable that up to 1860, there was not one drunkard's grave filled by a bondsman in America. There was no loss of time from dissipation, little waste of values in liquors, and no police expense about disorders. Thus in 1850, when the whole population of the North was about thirteen and a half millions, and of the South nine and a half (whites and blacks) the hireling societies had 23,664 criminal convictions, while the South had 2,921. The same year the North was supporting 114,704 paupers; the South 20,563. In Boston, Mass., and the adjacent county, the persons in jails, houses of correction, or refuge, and almshouses, bore among the blacks, the ratio of one to sixteen of that population; and among the whites, of one to every thirty-four. The same year in Richmond, Va., the same unhappy classes bore; among the blacks, the ratio of one to forty-six, and among the whites, of one to one hundred and twelve. Had the industry of the hireling system really been greatly more profitable than that of the Southern, the expense of all this excess of crime would have eaten up the whole overplus and more.

3. The Southern system always presented an economic advantage, in the stable and peaceable relation it established between capital and labor. Every year since its overthrow has but illustrated this advantage, and sober minds were never so well prepared to appreciate it, as by the strikes and angry contests between employers and hirelings, which approach every season more nearly the fearful dimensions of anarchy and civil war. How shall capital enjoy that quiet, sure and steady control of hireling labor, which is absolutely essential to production; and yet hireling labor be protected against injustice, and against that depression of wages under their stern law of supply and demand in an increasing population, which pauperizes labor? This is the insoluble question, the very crux of the scientific economists, before which they stand confused and helpless. The "labor unions" may result in anarchy, or in com-

munism, or in a "reign of terror": they will never lead to a wholesome solution.

The Southern system solved it, so far as the classes of laborers under it was engaged, by a simple and complete remedy. This was to abolish the very conditions of the strife, by making the laborer the property of the capitalist. One result efficaciously secured was, that the laborers could never be pauperized or reduced below a comfortable and efficient standard of subsistence: because the capitalist, in doing this, would be destroying his own property. Another result was, that there were no controversies nor strikes, so wasteful of time and subsistence, and so obstructive of production. Still another was, that it was impossible for the laborer ever to feel that most cruel of all wants, the want of work, while willing to work, and pressed by starvation if he did not.

The South, instead of ever witnessing that pitiful and harrowing scene lately enacted in London, when six thousand desperate men with starving wives and children behind them, beset the government offices demanding, in vain, not bread, but work, to be beaten back by the police; never once in a century saw the head of one black family "out of work" except on his intended holidays.

For the master knew that, whether any work were going on or not he had that family to feed and clothe, and preserve from destitution, to this both the law and his own interests must imperiously force him. Hence the master felt a powerful interest in foreseeing, in prearranging, in dedicating his own capital to some useful labor, which if not immediately productive, would ultimately be so; so that in every emergency there should be for his laborers some work compensated by subsistence. If the price of a product fell, by some commercial or political cause, beneath the level of profitable production, the master did not and could not resort to the usual relief of the hireling system: suspend all production and dismiss the laborers to starve, if it might be so! No: he suspended this production, and directed the labor at once to some other task provided by his capital and foresight. If the given farm staple ceased to pay the cost of production, the farm labor was diverted from it to some extensive work of drainage, stone fencing, clearing, or other amelioration which would increase future productions;

while the laborers drew, in advance, out of his capital, their accustomed comfortable remuneration.

4. In appraising the wealth of the South, we noticed the objection to counting the labor of the Africans as property, and while we demurred to its justice, we waived discussing it, as not desiring here to raise the ethical question. But all the laws, all the business usages, and the full faith of the country regarded that labor as property. It was taxable (not only with a poll, but a property tax), was vendible, could be bequeathed, and made subject to lien, or hire. From this usage the industry of the country derived at least this advantage: That the basis of credits was thus very greatly widened. The prudent use of credits is a wonderful aid to production. When a debt exists, it is a great advantage to the business of the country, that the just creditor shall find assets out of which to realize payment. A "bad debt" is usually a dead loss to the productive capital of the country. To strip a business man of the means of giving security for a loan, is to strip him of commercial credit, and thus to cripple his prosperity by a most hurtful imposition. Thus the smaller business man of Texas is already beginning to learn that the various homestead, and exemption laws, making it impossible for him, even by his own consent, to use his property as security for loans, injure instead of protecting him. Their only effect is to shut him inexorably out from what perhaps is most essential for his prosperity, all access to a cheap loan market. He is stripped of the power of commercial credits as though a pauper. Thus, this legislation, which professes to protect the families of small means, is really a law to tie the hands of the poor man and give the rich man, who has sufficient property over and above all exemptions to offer full security, a deadly advantage against him in the loan market. The hireling system wrought a parallel disadvantage against its people, as compared with the South, by affecting to regard labor as not a value, and thus crippling the power to borrow: while the South, by making so large a part of its labor a value, doubled its solid credit.

5. Among the most luminous and valuable contributions to economic science in our age, are those investigations by which the English writers, Mill and Wakefield, and numerous accurate French and German observers have proved, and ex-

plained, the superior economy of moderately large over small productive operations. Indeed, the demonstration is practically so sweeping, in the manufacturing industries, that it has revolutionized the civilized world. The individual producer has been annihilated by being undersold by the larger manufacturer.

Where is the hand loom: the domestic forge producing axes, hoes, horse-shoes, the country wheelwright, the country shoemaker? The farm cannot even afford to produce its own axe-helve, though the hickory may grow in its hedge row.

The same economic rule applies to moderately large agriculture, as compared with peasant proprietors. The large farming produces more economically, because it permits more application of the all-important principle of "division of labor." It allows that assortment of labor, applying the cheaper hands to the lighter tasks, which save so much.

On the well organized Southern farm, the plough, the axe, the scythe, the hoe, the team offered constant and remunerative work to the strong men; while the less valuable labor of the boys and girls, and the elderly, was equally as effective in the lighter task. But on the peasant proprietor's farm, the strong man, whose every day should have been worth to him a dollar, is compelled to spend many days in picking beans; where the child, worth a shilling a day, would pick as many. The larger farm permits the essential advantage of combination of labor. How can one man stack sheaves of grain, without a waste of time and toil almost heartbreaking, in descending from the stack, and ascending with every handful of sheaves? This is the extreme instance. But there are many operations, in which four or five men can easily do more than four or five times as much as one man. All the purchases for the large farm can be made more savingly, because in larger quantities and at a wholesale price. But especially is the gain great in the employment of better implements and machinery. The Southern planter or farmer usually employed a part of his capital liberally, in providing these known to science. But how can the peasant proprietor of Belgium or France, whose farm is five acres, afford a three-horse plow, that essential of thorough tillage; or, indeed, any plow at all? Or a McCormick's reaper, or mower? Or an effective thresher? He produces his little crops

(confessedly large for his minute surface) at a wasteful expense of time and toil, with the spade, the wheelbarrow, the sickle and the flail. The attempt has been made to foil these facts, by assenting, that a richer peasant, or co-partnership, may own the thresher, and perambulate the neighborhood, hiring it out. This only palliates the evil. A large percentage of the time is lost, removing and re-setting the heavy machinery; many laborers have to be specially hired, at very special prices: and the tolls charged are always much above just cost. Many praises have been bestowed upon the economy of these small peasant farms: "The very grass along the gutters of the chaussee, the succulent weeds from the rows of the sugar beet field, are all saved for the domestic animals." Yes but at a ruinous cost of wasted time. This is the shape which the sensible observer sees these savings take in those countries. He sees a bevy of five, seven or ten strapping young women, sallying forth at 1 o'clock p. m. from the "Dorf," each with her little sickle and huge hamper, to spend the long, bright afternoon in a tramp of a mile and a half to their parents' little sections, and in saving and bearing home (converting themselves into beasts of burden) each, two pfenwings' worth weeds or grass to be fed to the calf or milch goat. But those girls, on a well ordered Virginia farm, would have raked, dried, and loaded on the well-appointed wagons, in that one afternoon ten or twenty tons of clover hay or wheat sheaves, or oats: or later in the season have gathered each 150 pounds of seed cotton, at the minimum average of 50 cents per hundred pounds. These were frightfully wasteful savings: They are only justified by the fact, that the bad organization of this, so-called "free labor system," has made this labor, which should be so valuable, nearly worthless to their families.

Now, the force of these facts is in the following view. That if the advocate of the hiring system is to evade this fatal argument, he must advocate large farming by hiring labor. But the moment he does so, he must bid farewell to all his pretty Arcadian pictures of the snug little "glebe tilled by the willing hands of the peasant proprietor, instead of the loitering, reluctant slave." He must accept and justify all those consequences, which the universal experience of hiring States prove to be inseparable from high farming with adequate capital and

science: the eviction of the cotton tenantry: the horrible "gang system" of field labor: the polluting "bothy-system" of lodging, and the brutal abominations disclosed by the British parliament as to their large agriculture. Such, indeed, is the unavoidable tendency of the hireling system in this age of mechanical improvement: for it leads directly to the heaping up of unduly large fortunes (for reasons to be shown) and the inflation of money-oligarchs, "making the rich richer and the poor poorer." But the Southern system, while not favorable to these disproportioned aggregations, opposed an effectual barrier to those mischievously small subdivisions of the land, to which the small holdings must inevitably run in a democracy.

The drift of the system was to fill the country chiefly (with a few exceptions like that of Washington of Mt. Vernon) with moderate holdings, from those of the snug yeomanry with two or three bondsmen to the easy country gentleman with some hundreds of acres.

The smallest were not too small to employ most of the profitable appliances; the largest were not so large as to be cumbersome.

No economist disputes the extreme advantage of intelligence to production, especially in these days of applied science. Now, the man addicted to daily toil cannot usually acquire the intelligence, or the knowledge of the sciences bearing on production, which is the customary possession of the master, whose labors are chiefly those of superintendence, and who, though a busy man, yet had time for reading. Thus the result of the Southern system was, that the best, the most advanced mind of the society had the full direction of the methods of the operations. The "field hands" and especially the "head men" were usually very skillful in their manual labor; capital practical "crop masters" for the ordinary crops, good judges of weather, of the proper tillage and harvesting of those crops, and handlers of teams. The landholders were in addition, men of reading, acquainted with every advance in machinery, applied science, chemical manures, the physiology of stock breeding; and eager for every enlightened experiment in husbandry.

6. It is as true in political, as in household economy, that "saving is more than making." The growth of capital depends proximately on the saving. Of course, natural agents, pre-ex-

isting capital, and labor must first create the additional values. But whether they shall be annihilated in unproduction, consumption, or be added to the saved up and devoted to reproductive consumption, depends wholly on their being saved. Now, saving means self-denial. Self-denial means the mental and moral ability to appreciate a distant invisible future good: that namely, to be hereafter yielded by subsequent returns of the capital saved; more than a present visible one. The public conditions favorable for such saving are, of course, security of rights and possessions, and quiet and stability of governments. But the personal conditions which stimulate them to save are, as plainly, intelligence, self-control, virtue and aspirations. The more animal and sensuous holder of newly acquired values will prefer the immediate and visible enjoyments they potentially contain. The more intellectual holder will prefer the invisible, distant, but larger good they can yield, not once, but annually, as reproductive capital. The more selfish man will prefer at once to gratify himself: The more disinterested and virtuous man will think more of the good of his children and country.

We hence expect, just what all history proves: that the most intelligent and elevated classes are always the most saving, in proportion to their acquisitions. No one has argued this more powerfully, or illustrated it more profusely, than Mr. Mill. Political Econ. Bk. I. Ch. II.

Hence, it is always more favorable to the steady growth of capital, that the successive years' earnings of the society be controlled and administered by the highest class. No kind of society ever attained this result so completely as the Southern. For, the owner as master not only disposed of the revenue of the estate, directed its whole expenditure or investment; but as guardians of the laborers and their families, he and his wife administered the year's supply of food, clothing and comforts, for them all. Even had the master and mistress had no higher standard of forecast, prudence and administrative skill than the average African, this would have still resulted in a great economy. Let us say that there were seven laborers' families. There was a much greater saving of supplies and of labor and of time, in having the housekeeping of the whole directed by one head, rather than having seven separate kitchens, each

with its streams of petty wastes, seven laundries, and seven varying managements: the major part of them recklessly wasteful. Now add to this the executive and directing skill of the most intelligent, foreseeing and responsible couple of all on the plantation (the master and his wife) and the advantage becomes grand. Consequently, no cluster of seven laboring men's families in any country of the world got so much of material good and comfort out of the portion of revenue set apart for them, as the bondsmen on the plantation.

Wastes were minimized; an enlightened system and economy presided over all.

This saving administration appeared especially at one point, when observers from hireling States perversely insisted on seeing the main evidence of Southern poverty. No business man nor economist would dare to dispute this proposition: That it is conducive to the public wealth to have values not only produced, or created, as economically as possible, but also circulated as economically as possible. For in fact, the labor of circulation, distribution, which is commercial industry, is also production. In transferring and dividing a value for the intending consumer, this industry has as truly created an increment of value in the commodity, as the manufacturer has, who turns a woolen fleece into a coat. Every agent of distribution then, who really contributes an agency essential to circulation of the commodity, is a producing agent. But he who has included himself into the circulation, where his agency really contributes nothing valuable to the process, is worse than a non-productive agent—he is a nuisance, grasping a wage for a service not needed, and eating up the values produced by honest men than himself. Thus in the change of a fleece into a useful coat, the industry of the spinner, the weaver, and the cloth dresser; was each useful, and created an item of additional value. But let us suppose that another fellow had intruded himself into the manufacture as second dyer, insisting on doing something to the color of the cloth, which was already perfect, and charging his share of wages therefor; he would have been a mischievous consumer, instead of a productive agent.

So every "middleman" in the operations of circulation of commodities, whose intervention is unnecessary, is an unproductive consumer. His gains are his fellow-citizens' losses; and



his activity and prosperity are nuisances. Just such nuisances the Southern system avoided, by the simple method of a domestic economy which distributed the products needed for subsistence among the bondsmen, without any commercial apparatus, or profit-charges. That useless middleman, the retail provision merchant, was eliminated. The farmer who employed the adults of, say, seven families, reserved in his own granary out of the crop reared by the conjoined agency of his capital and supervision, and their labor, four hundred bushels of grain for their bread. These breadstuff, when ground by his order, were issued for the daily food of all the families, most probably under the mistress' eye. Let us now suppose this farm conducted by hired labor, representing the working force of seven families. The proprietor has no use for these four hundred bushels of grain; he sells it at the wholesale price. But the laborers must eat; they buy the same grain from the grocery store, enhanced by the cost of two handlings and two transportations, and also by the retail profit. The difference is that the proprietor does not get any more; and laborers pay much more for their subsistence. The gross and shrewd fellow who has intruded himself between proprietor and laborer, grasps a large profit, but produces nothing.

Yet the economists of hireling States have actually been blind enough to point to this contrast between their countries and the South, as proofs of their thrift. Their rural regions are dotted over with large and pretentious "stores," where the corn, wool, butter, leather, and even soft-soap, which the laborers should have drawn directly from the employers, at wholesale prices, are resold to them at high retail prices, to the serious reduction of the avails of their labor, with no compensating production for the community in any shape. And this mischievous bustle is called prosperity! It would be exactly parallel to argue that hireling labor was more gainful, because hireling societies had larger jails.

7. One more view remains, confirming and explaining the superior economical results of the Southern system: It is at once the most fundamental and the most grateful to the philanthropic mind. Our system exerted a powerful influence against unproductive consumption of values, and in favor of productive consumption; by constraining the proprietor to ap-

propriate the largest share of his annual revenue to his servants' comfortable subsistence, and to suitable appliances for their productive employment during the next season. Every economist knows the difference: every mind of common sense ought to know it.

For instance: Previous labor, with the aid of capital, has produced a half ton of coal. This may be used to form the nucleus of a great bonfire, at a political jollification. It is so consumed as to be annihilated as a value, and that forever, leaving no production behind it. Or, it may be used to heat a charge in the furnace of a foundry, by which pig-iron worth one and one-half cents per pound, is converted into utensils, as tea-kettles, stoves, and so forth, worth five cents per pound. There is a creation here of new values in the pre-existing material represented by three and a half cents per pound. Now again, this coal is consumed: as truly as in the bonfire, and is no more anything but vapor and ashes. But its value reappears in the new values of the iron utensils, and that with increase. It needs no arguing, that unproductive consumption is destructive to all increment of capital: and thus to future production, by the means of that value; while productive consumption reproduces capital and enlarges it, thus providing for future production ever after. Let another fact be added, known to all economists: That the presence of capital is one of the most essential conditions for enlarging the demand for labor, thus tending to give employment to more human hands, and at better prices.

\* A weak and indeed wicked attempt has been made to parry this view by arguing that the demand for luxuries by persons receiving large revenues, is favorable to the working classes: inasmuch as it makes a market for products, circulates money, and thus "encourages industry." Thirty years ago we refuted this doctrine, in an argument which has been several times jeered at, but never answered.

The potent authority of Say sustained the truths at that early day. It is pleasant to find the same correct view now supported by Mill and the current of recent economists. The outline of our argument is this: That since the consumption of luxuries is unproductive consumption, notwithstanding a partial and temporary gain, in the form of wages, for the luxury produced: the ultimate result is the destruction of values,

the diminution of capital, and thus, an inevitable restriction in the demand for labor in general, a decline in its wages, and a scarcity of the staple values, which these producers of luxuries should have been creating, for the common good. Just in the degree there is luxurious expenditure at the upper end of the social ladder, there must be destitution and misery at the lower end, for want of employment, and of necessary articles of subsistence. This is confirmed by the facts in every luxurious society on earth. This consumption of luxuries does not encourage, but misdirects industry. Now there is more than one way, in which the hireling system promotes luxurious and unproductive consumption, more than the Southern system did. It has a much stronger tendency to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, to create excessive wealth in a few hands. This at once enables and tempts the very rich to this waste of revenue, so adverse to the growth of capital and prosperity of labor. But chiefly the hireling system releases proprietors from a wholesome and beneficent check, which the Southern system operated. To the capitalist who hires, the laborer is nothing after the production is completed. If he perishes, the employer is not concerned; he has lost nothing, he has only to step out into the teeming labor market, to fill the vacant place—such an employer then naturally feels more inclined to use spare revenue in pomps and indulgences. But the Southern system made the labor of the African property, created an omnipotent motive in the master to preserve not only its existence, but its health and efficiency, and besides, appealed to his self-respect, and to the domestic tie to reinforce this obligation. Hence, as soon as the annual revenue was ascertained, the proprietor appropriated, as a first charge upon it, so much as would subsist the Africans for another year, and this subsistence must come up to such a level as would not only preserve their lives, but their health and efficiency. Next, the proprietor must unavoidably set off so much, for an addition, or reparation to his working capital, as was necessary to provide the full means and appliances for the ensuing year's industrial operations. And as he knew that he was responsible for making that coming year a profitable one, and that the calamity of an unsuccessful one must strike him first and mainly: both interest and stern necessity forbade his stinting that appropriation. If worn or an-

tiquated tools and machinery needed to be replaced; if drainage and permanent fencing were called for; if the arrival of new laborers at adult age called for a larger area of land to be either cleared or purchased; all these must perforce form a prior charge on revenue. Not until both these demands were met, and met without grudging, could one dollar of revenue be taken for superfluities. If no surplus remained, the results were perfectly simple: Madame must just postpone the purchase of the new carriage or carpet. Mademoiselle must just do without the new piano another season. Young master must forego the blood saddle-horse, and even, in all probability put off the University; and go to teaching for a year, instead, so as to earn money to pay his own education.

This picture is perfectly sustained by all who know the two sections by personal observation. Partisans spoke of the South as "the aristocratic section." But while her proprietors sought solid comfort, kept a good table, chiefly from the resources of the mistresses' admirable skill, devotion and economy, as housewives; and always practiced a liberal and social hospitality, men of equal wealth usually expended about one-fifth of the sums wasted by their Northern equals, in equipage and luxuries. In one prosperous trading town of the North you should find more palatial residences than in all the Southern continent from the Potomac to the Gulf. The good, solid, plain, old ancestral dwelling of the planter owning \$100,000, would have been pulled away as rubbish by the New York man, who had gotten his \$50,000, and was setting up his home on Sixth (not to say Fifth) avenue. Two Richmond merchants, in New York before the war, were taking the air in Fifth avenue. They passed the new glittering palace of a parvenue manufacturer. After admiring its costly elegance, the younger pointed his friend to a smaller house in the rear, with brown-stone walls and plate glass windows, asking, "Can you surmise, B., what that is?" B. could not. "Why, that is the owner's stable." "Then," exclaimed B., "I wonder if he would not let me be his horse?" Old Mr. B.'s jest was perfectly sober; although he was, in descent, in integrity, in courtesy and in intelligence, truly a merchant prince; the dwelling which he inherited from a distinguished father, and in which he was then dispensing an elegant hospitality and rearing a cultivated family, had a much

less pretentious exterior than the parvenue's stable. This contrast was typical.

It is easy for the economist to infer how promotive of solid progressive wealth that system must have been, which regularly laid its prior liens on revenue, in favor of the productive laborers and the producing capital, instead of luxuries and equipage, and the costly pomps of unproductive architecture.

And it is easy for the heart of the philanthropist to decide which is the more pleasing aspect: that which treated the laborers employed as mere tools of production, to be discarded when used; or that which ensured their having the prior lien on the profits of their own labor?

# MEMOIRS OF FRANCIS S. SAMPSON, D. D.

---

## PREFACE.

---

The board of directors of Union Seminary, at their annual meeting after the death of Dr. Sampson, determined that it was proper to present to the churches, his brethren, and former pupils, some memorial of his Christian and professional character. They requested me to prepare such a sketch; and the following sketch is the result. So far as a full and intimate acquaintance with his life, first as a pupil, and then as a colleague, can qualify one for such a task, that qualification I possess. And if an ardent personal attachment unfits one to draw the character of its object impartially, I must confess to this disqualification. It is for those who knew Dr. Sampson as well as I did, to judge whether the portraiture is accurate. I can express no better wish towards all his brethren and former pupils, than that the reading of this humble tribute to their lost friend, may give them the same mournful delight, and the same elevating and purifying lessons, which its preparation has given me. It is now affectionately dedicated to the Alumni of Union Theological Seminary, to the candidates for the ministry, and to the Christian young men of the Synods of North Carolina and Virginia.

A life, spent, like Dr. Sampson's, far from the stormier scenes of the world, amidst scholastic shades, offers little material for narrative. I have, therefore, only attempted, after giving a brief outline of his uneventful life, to unfold the nature of his work and his character, and to indicate some of those lessons which they teach us.

ROBERT L. DABNEY,

Union Theological Seminary, Va.

May 28th, 1855.

## INTRODUCTORY OUTLINE.

---

Dr. Sampson was the son of Mr. Richard Sampson, an eminent and respected agriculturist in the neighborhood of the Dover Mills, in the county of Goochland. He was born between the 1st and 5th of November, A. D. 1814. In 1830, he was placed at the school, and in the family of that man of God, Rev. Thornton Rogers, of Albemarle, who was his maternal uncle. Here he made a profession of religion, was baptized, and became a member of the Presbyterian church in Charlottesville, then in charge of Rev. Francis Bowman, on the 13th of August, 1831. The 10th of September of the same year, he entered the University of Virginia, and continued his studies there till July, 1836, taking a very extensive and thorough course of study, not only in the academic departments, but in the schools of junior law, anatomy and physiology, and securing the degree of M. A. which was then, as now, attained by very few. November 9th, 1836, he entered Union Theological Seminary, Va. On the resignation of Professor Ballantine, in the spring of 1838, he was made teacher of Hebrew, and from that time continued to perform other duties of the oriental department. He was licensed by East Hanover Presbytery in October, 1839, and ordained as an evangelist by the same Presbytery in October, 1841. In July, 1848, he took a journey to Europe, for the prosecution of his oriental studies, and returned in August, 1849, having spent the year chiefly at the Universities of Halle and Berlin. In October, 1848, he was elected professor of oriental literature and languages in the Seminary; but he had for many years performed the work of a full professor, though with the title and compensation of an assistant, and had long been esteemed as second to none of his colleagues in the value of his labors. About the time of his return from Germany, he also received the honorary degree of D. D. from Hampden Sidney college. He fell asleep Sabbath, the 9th of April, 1854, only thirty-nine years and five months old.

Thus brief and uneventful is the record of his life, which was passed almost wholly in the quiet shades of colleges. But the results of this life have not therefore been unimportant. The attempt will be made to draw the features of his character as a Christian and Christian minister, a scholar and an instructor, in order that we may praise God for his grace manifested in him, and may receive the advantages of an example most modest, and yet illustrious.

## CHAPTER I.

Person and Constitution. Dignity and Courtesy of Manner. Early Habits and Maxims. Influence of Example in a Different Sphere

Dr. Sampson was in person light and graceful, and of a florid complexion. Although his family has shown pulmonary tendencies in several of its members, and his own lungs were ultimately much impaired in their soundness, for the first thirty years of his life he enjoyed, by virtue of great temperance, most uniform health, and endured an immense amount of severe study. After he reached that age, he was gradually broken down by several attacks of acute disease, and though his health gave a delusive promise of restoration the last year of his life, he finally fell before a short and violent attack of pneumonia.

His personal habits, as to diet, sleep and recreation, were simple, methodical and temperate, without being ascetic. His dress was scrupulously neat and appropriate, without the faintest approach to display. In his approaches to his fellow men there was the happiest union of unaffected modesty and graceful quietude with Christian dignity. Yet his was a dignity which repelled no advances of affection or confidence, nor anything but impertinence. His friends who most desired to see him shine in society as his solid worth entitled him, sometimes accounted him too modest. Yet, with a modesty which almost amounted to diffidence, he was the farthest of all men from a timid or truckling expression of his opinions. When an erroneous sentiment which he conceived to be of any importance was thrust upon him in conversation, he most distinctly defended his own opinion, with a singular union of inflexible, even impracticable mental honesty and courteous deference. He was the last man in the world to be wheedled into the softening of a truth down, or the admission of a faint shade of the error he had been opposing, by any of the blandishments of politeness, or by the fear of seeming too pertinacious. Much of the singular amiability of his social character is no doubt to be attributed to the influence of grace. Had he grown up un-



converted, he would have been known as a man of high and determined temper, of energetic will, and persevering activity. Divine grace softened what was violent, and refined what was valuable in this temperament, until the result was a rare and lovely union of the strong and the sweet.

One of Dr. Sampson's most striking and valuable natural traits was his methodical industry. To any one who knows his ancestry, it is very plain that this quality was received from them, both by inheritance and inculcation. That whatever is worth doing, is worth doing well; that each task must be done with one's might, in just so much time as is needed to do it perfectly, and no more; that no task is to be left till all is perfected which can be done to advantage; these were the rules of working which he carried with him from the home of his boyhood to the school, the university, the study, the lecture room. The same thoroughness, the same deep ploughing, the same complete harrowing, the same utter extirpation of obstructions, the same perfect finish which characterized the farm of his father, prevailed in his scholarship and instructions. It would be hard to estimate how much of his usefulness and ability was due to the example and habits thus impressed on his youth. And we cannot but admire the wisdom of Providence in training, on such a field and by agencies so unconscious of the divine purposes, a quality which was afterwards to do so much good in a higher and nobler sphere of duty. Dr. Sampson, the eminent hebraist, the profound expositor, the masterly instructor, was but the far-seeing, energetic, able farmer reproduced on another field of action.

---

## CHAPTER II.

Enters Rev. Thornton Rogers' School. Religious Impressions. Decision. Personal Covenant. Diary. University of Virginia. Christian Activity there. Dr. White's Testimony. Goes to Union Theological Seminary. Zeal. Devotional Spirit. Humility. Liberality.

We cannot proceed farther, without attempting to draw his Christian character. This was in several respects singular: but in most, singularly excellent. The neighborhood in which he grew up, was very irregularly supplied with the preaching of

the Gospel, and was wholly unblessed with a sound pastoral influence. Consequently, domestic religion and pious training were nearly unknown. From a brief diary which Dr. Sampson kept during a part of the session of 1833-4, we learn that when he went to the Rev. Mr. Rogers' school, he did not possess a Bible of his own, and had never read more than very limited portions of it in his life. His character was wholly irreligious; and he was given to all the light and corrupting amusements of fashionable young persons. But he tells us, that the only out-breaking vice in which he indulged, was profane swearing; and this he contracted at the age of twelve, from vexation in a game of whist, in which he had an unusually bad hand. With such a character, he found himself in a new world, in the well-ordered, Christian family of his uncle. There the word of God was daily read, and his name reverently worshipped in the family. Although little personal exhortation was addressed to him concerning his sins and impenitence, he saw daily illustrations of the excellence and peace of Christian principles, in the harmonious happiness of a pious house, where "brethren dwelt together in unity"; and above all, where the beauty of holiness shone from the example of the godly father, as he presided in the family and school room. In consequence chiefly of these silent teachings, he gradually fell into a state of profound religious concern, which continued about twelve months. His feelings were studiously concealed from all, through fear of ridicule; and the love of sin led him to put forth many and bitter struggles against the Spirit. But the God who loved him would not let him go; and his convictions were from time to time strengthened. In the spring of 1831, he chanced to hear a sermon from the Rev. Mr. Staunton, then of Prince Edward, from the text, "Secret things belong unto the Lord thy God," which was the means of sweeping away all his objections and excuses. His convictions now became so pungent that they compelled him to an outward reform of his life, and to set about seeking a present Saviour in earnest. But the fear of reproach and love of sin still made desperate struggles. On one occasion, while several of his school fellows were engaged with him in a game of marbles, one of them sneeringly observed, "Frank must be getting pious. Do you notice, boys, that he has not been heard to swear for a fortnight?" This taunt stung

him to the quick; and to show that he was not justly liable to their insinuation, he took the very first plausible occasion to throw out a most profane oath! But this heaven-daring act was made the crisis of his rebellion. For, his remorse, alarm of conscience, and fear of having grieved the Holy Spirit, together with his convictions of the corruption of his nature, and impotence of his own resolutions for piety became immediately so agonizing, that he was compelled to retire, and cast himself at once upon the Saviour's mercy. From this hour, his soul seems to have been built upon the rock Christ Jesus; and his face was turned decisively heavenward. He now first divulged his religious feelings to his uncle, in a letter which he handed him without seal or signature, and which detailed his struggles, his ignorance, his decision to be on the Lord's side, and his dawning peace.

Mr. Rogers had often made his salvation the subject of his secret wrestling with God. But so complete had been the concealment of Dr. Sampson's convictions, that his uncle was at this very time almost in despair of his conversion. And though Dr. Sampson had ever been docile and industrious in everything else, so impressed was his uncle with the evil influence which his profanity might exert in his family, that he had seriously considered the best means of removing him. As he was the son of a beloved sister, he had seriously thought of disbanding his school for a time, as the least painful mode of securing this end. Indeed, he had only been deterred by intercessions of others, from carrying this purpose into effect. How delightful, then, must have been the surprise with which he received this letter, telling him that the great work had gone on so far under ground? This curious incident may carry home two truths to us, "That we should not be weary in well doing; for in due season we shall reap if we faint not"; and that much of the seed of truth which we sow is often lost, or smothered, for want of more constant and tender nursing.

But Dr. Sampson was more the spiritual child of the Rev. Thornton Rogers, than of any other person. He has often said that the means which efficaciously awakened him out of death in trespasses and sins, was not so much any particular sermon or warning, as the holy and consistent life of his uncle. This

was to him the sermon, the rebuke, the "living epistle," which revealed to him his spiritual necessities.

No man since the Apostle Paul could use more truthfully his language, "When it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Dr. Sampson was about to leave his uncle's roof, where alone he could expect to find any religious sympathy among his own friends, to return for a few weeks to his native neighborhood, in which every affectionate attention of his relatives would be a temptation, and where there were no sanctuary privileges nor Christian communings to help him on his way. Thence he was to go, in the early autumn, to the University of Virginia—an institution opened only six years before under infidel auspices, without prayers, chaplain, Bible class, Sabbath school—yea, we may say, without Sabbath; so that almost all godly parents kept their sons away from it with a pious dread; and vital religion was nearly unknown among its students.

We have seen the strong and almost fatal hold which the fear of ridicule had on his natural heart. Yet, from the moment his stand was taken, although but a youth of sixteen, fear was at an end. A courage more fixed than that of man, had taken possession of his breast. One of his first acts after confessing Christ, was to prepare a written address to his school-mates, intended for the close of the session, in which he urges upon them the claims of Christianity. These were the same school mates, whose ridicule had a little before almost driven him to reject the Holy Ghost! In his address, he discusses the following causes, which induce irreligious men to postpone attention to the Gospel: "An unwarranted dependence on the general mercy of God; objections to the incomprehensible mysteries contained in the Bible; and especially, the incomprehensibility of the doctrine of a Trinity; cavils against the number of sects into which Christians are divided, and their bickerings; and skeptical doubts of the truth of the Scriptures." These points are discussed, without striking originality indeed, but with a distinctness of thought, order and justice, most remarkable in a school boy: and the temper of the address is marked by a happy union of Christian boldness and affection.

The same decision of religious character marked all his

Christian course. His religion was now everything. His Bible was almost his only companion, among *books*. The fact that he learned so little of Christianity through the colored and somewhat distorted medium, in which it is presented by the prescriptive religious habits and expressions of even good people, but drew his religious ideas direct from the Word of God, under the teachings of the Holy Spirit, may account for much of the excellence and symmetry of his religious character. In all his intercourse with relatives and associates, in his amusements and devotions, in everything, the desire to please God was uppermost.

There yet exists a correspondence of considerable bulk, extending through the five years of his University course, and later, with two favorite female cousins. In these letters, the desire to benefit their souls and his own, is ever the prominent, almost the sole concern. The great topic is approached at once, without squeamish circumlocutions, but with affectionate dignity and delicacy. His correspondents are continually reminded, that the chief aim and glory of a Christian friendship should be, to give and receive edification, by the interchange of experiences and advice. He has no news or gossip to detail. Even from the first year of his Christian life, these letters show a depth of experience and a range and fullness of Christian knowledge, such as we would expect from a mature saint. From them and his brief diary, we learn with what punctuality and solemn diligence he engaged in the study of God's Word, searching his own heart, and secret prayer, as the first great business of each day.

We learn he declined living with a room mate during his second session, because his room mate the previous session, though amiable and moral, was unconverted; and his presence robbed him of his regular hours for secret devotion. In this exigency he was accustomed to resort to a wooded mountain hard by, for communion with God. And when, at the beginning of his third session, he received into his room a young gentleman like-minded to himself, who afterwards became a most intimate Christian friend, an arrangement was made for retirement, as well as daily social prayer. From this friend we learn that when the hour of secret prayer found him languid and indisposed to devotion, instead of making such a state a pretext

for the postponement of the duty, he found in it a powerful motive for its more diligent performance. However fatigued or overworked, he would take his Bible and read and meditate till he could bow his knees in the proper frame, saying that this languor and coldness were the very evidences that he needed fervent prayer at that special time.

The first of January, 1834, he held a solemn review of the past year, and the state of his soul, and entered into a formal written covenant, to which his name is attached, engaging, with divine assistance, to live a life of entire devotion. The form of covenant is marked as a quotation. Although conceived very much in the terms of the one given in Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, for the young Christian covenanting with God, it is not copied thence; and the source from which it was taken is not known. Perhaps it is enough to say that it is couched in terms of most devout and humble confession, ardent breathings after holiness, and adoring reverence of the divine perfections. Though the subsequent diary shows that those alternations of strength and weakness, joy and sorrow, were not wholly unknown to him, which are found in the experience of all eminent saints, yet this era was no doubt a new starting point to his soul in its religious race.

It is a characteristic fact that this diary, after having been punctually kept for several months, was discontinued. The ground assigned at its close was, that he began to suspect himself of coloring the statements of his feelings, from an involuntary reference to their being some day seen by others, and he feared that thus his Christian sincerity might be corrupted!

Such holy diligence in prayer, such singleness of aim and such watchfulness, could not fail of their reward. He seems to have lived in the habitual exercise of religious joy; and often his soul mounted up with wings like eagles. It is believed that from his conversion to the day of his death, no serious cloud ever overshadowed his assurance. He lived continually under the peaceful light of a sure hope! How fully was the truth verified, in his Christian courage, consistency and intense activity for God, "The joy of the Lord is your strength?"

His position as a pious student among two hundred and fifty thoughtless young men, gave ample occasion to illustrate his Christian decision. But yet, this quality was so admirably

tempered with modesty and kindness, that it secured, instead of enmity, almost universal respect. His manner was quiet, simple, and unobtrusive. His religion was never thrust upon the notice of any one; but when any assault was made upon his principles, they were found immovable. He was obliging to all, even to the profane, wherever the sacrifice of conscience was not asked for. So kindly and unpharisaic was his demeanor, that many, then entirely irreligious, became warmly attached to him, and his usual college name was "Neighbor Sampson." Yet, so sincere was the respect for his principles, a thoughtless and profane student was heard once to remark, "I *can't* swear before Neighbor Sampson"; adding that there was no other Christian student in the University to whom he would pay the tribute of such a self-restraint. It is doubted whether a single taint, or one word disrespectful to his religion, was ever offered him with malicious intent among all the hundreds of ungodly young men by whom he was surrounded.

Let this be an effectual lesson to every young person, who shall read the character of this man of God, never more to be held in bondage by the fear of reproach or ridicule. An honest, Christian courage commands the involuntary homage of the worst. It is weakness and inconsistency which provoke the gibe and sneer. Dr. Sampson was not protected from them by any of those brilliant popular talents which dazzle the imagination of young men; for his abilities were not then appreciated. He was regarded as a plain and unpretending young man, whose conduct was spotlessly consistent, and whose Christian courage was unshakable. It was this which covered him, amidst the most heaven-daring sinners, with a shield of affectionate respect.

The next trait of his Christian character to be noted, was: His strict conscientiousness. Never have we known a Christian who seemed more habitually to walk

"As ever in his great task-master's eye."

This conscientiousness was seen in the minutest pecuniary transactions, and in the scrupulous care with which he used the interests and property of the Seminary, and of those who entrusted their concerns to him. That word of our Lord was to him a living precept, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much."

Instances of his scrupulousness might be mentioned, which some might almost regard as showing a "morbid conscience." We can only say—Would to God that all his people were infected with the same disease. There was nothing morbid or exaggerated in his Christian character. On the contrary, uniformity and good sense were its peculiar traits.

As instances of his conscientiousness, take the following:

We find him determining that he cannot lend his notes of the professors' lectures (for he was a famous note taker) to fellow students who studied them on the Sabbath. Although, in all other cases, unbounded in his kindness, where he had reason to believe that they would be so abused, he inflexibly exacted their return on Saturday. We find him, in every friendly letter, zealous to communicate some spiritual gift; and on his return from social visits, he frequently taxed himself with unfaithfulness, because he had been satisfied with the innocence of his social enjoyments, and had not enough watched for openings to speak for Christ.

On a visit to his beloved Christian relatives in Albemarle, he not only seeks to do good to his cousins, but seized an opportunity to "go into the kitchen at his grand-father's and talk with old aunt Betty, the cook, about Christ, his righteousness and atonement, our weakness and dependence on him, and the glorious prospects of the Christian, and encourage her to constant prayer. She thanked me for my advice; and said she rejoiced in the Lord, and prayed that the Lord would make me happy and useful. She said she was so glad that I had come and talked with her about Christ. How happy is it, to be with a Christian, whether white or black! How good is my God, who revealeth himself to the poor and the ignorant, that feel their need of him! While I talked with this kindred spirit, my own soul was quickened, and the tear of sympathy dropped down my cheek. The old woman cannot read. Lord bless her soul, and give her grace, knowledge and true religion, with all its comforts. Let thy blessing rest on all with whom I conversed about Christ."

A few lines further we read this:

"Was detained by rain longer than I intended. Uncle Thornton lent me a horse to ride back. Conversed with the servant who came with me, about the danger of his immortal soul;



endeavored to make plain to him the way of salvation, and showed him how reasonable it would be for God to cut him off in his sins, before he could repent. Lord bless him with salvation."

And this, reader, was not in the glow of a first love, nor in a season of religious excitement. He had been a professed Christian nearly three years. How many ministers of the gospel may feel rebuke from these examples of evangelical zeal in a young college student!

In a like diligent spirit we find him performing each daily task, "as unto God and not man," regulating his diet with solemn Christian self-denial, because he found himself sometimes indisposed, by partial excess, to prayer and meditation, and exerting his influence for good over his comrades by every means.

In his walks for recreation, he met with a plain but respectable countryman, seriously inclined, though not a believer; and this casual acquaintance was improved, to set on foot a Sabbath school in the mountains, and to seek the salvation of the farmer and his wife, by repeated visits, and careful instruction.

When he had fully dedicated himself to the ministry, and to the foreign missionary work, which, he then supposed, was to be his destination, he thrust aside obstacles to his great purpose, with a heroic self-denial, which can never be known, until the day which reveals the secrets of all hearts. In all the domestic relations of his subsequent life, in the duties of family devotions, in his functions as master and father, the inmate of his household could clearly perceive that God was continually before his eyes. As an officer of the Seminary he was ever at his post, with conscientious diligence. No sickness, which was not extreme, could detain him from his class room; and the first day of his last, fatal illness, he attempted to rise and attend to his classes, and only desisted from his purpose when literally overpowered by weakness.

The Christian reader will hardly need to be told, that such a believer as is above portrayed, abounded in active exertions, and the labors of love for Christ and perishing souls. To appreciate the strength of this active principle in him, we must remember the modesty, the almost shrinking diffidence of his Christian character. A few instances of his zeal to do good

have already been mentioned. When he went to the University of Virginia, there was no chaplain, nor religious observance of any kind. Occasional public worship had been held perhaps, by transient ministers of distinction; and the sound religious sentiment which distinguishes the bulk of our people, was beginning to make itself felt among the governors of the institution; so that they were not unwilling to pay the tribute of some outward religious observance to this public opinion. Soon after Dr. Sampson went there, the Rev. Mr. Hamet, a Methodist minister of great fluency, and popular rhetorical powers, preached in Charlottesville; and the most thoughtless students were fascinated with his abilities. Advantage was taken, of this, to introduce a permanent chaplain, and Mr. Hamet was the first who filled that office. The chaplain is usually selected by the faculty, with some conference with influential ministers of his own denomination, and is supported wholly by a voluntary subscription among the professors, students and other residents. He is chosen alternately from one of the four leading denominations, Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal and Presbyterian; and served at first one, but now two years. Dr. Sampson was very active in supporting this new enterprise, and gave valuable aid to Mr. Hamet, though his short stay in that office promised no very valuable religious results. He was succeeded by men of a more evangelical type; and to them all Dr. Sampson was a right hand, during his stay at the University, whatever their denomination. He was also the most active agent in originating the first Sabbath school in the University, and was its superintendent. We are assured by an eminent citizen, who was then a child in one of the families connected with the institution, that he was taught in this Sabbath school by Dr. Sampson, and there received his first saving impressions. The first private prayer meeting among the pious students of the University was equally indebted to his agency for its maintenance. It met every Sabbath evening; and we find in his short diary frequent references to his enjoyment of its Christian communion, and to his having addressed a word of exhortation to his brethren there.

The following sentences, communicated by the Rev. Dr. White, who was pastor of the Charlottesville church from the

spring of 1836 to 1848, happily express the position which Dr. Sampson then held there:

"My acquaintance with Dr. Sampson commenced in the spring of 1836. He was then just closing his course at the University of Virginia; and on the 4th of July of that year, he took the degree of M. A. with great credit. The South Plains church then embraced the Presbyterians living in the University and Charlottesville. There were not more than sixteen members living at these places. On my arrival, he called on me, and although very modest, yet convinced me in one short interview, that he was a youth of no ordinary talents and piety. He was then, I should suppose, about twenty years of age—between twenty-one and twenty-two. He entered with great interest into conversation on the subject of religion; and had evidently thought and prayed much for the prosperity of Zion. He gave me more information respecting the condition of the church, and both said and did more to cheer me in the work I was about to undertake, than any one with whom I met. I well remember the first attempt I made to have evening service in the dirty and dilapidated church. When I reached the house, I found it was neither lighted nor unlocked. As I stood in front of the building with half a dozen others, none of whom seemed to know what to do in this great emergency, Sampson came up, accompanied by several of his fellow students from the University. I was on the point of abandoning the undertaking in despair, when he, with his accustomed quickness and energy, said, 'Don't go yet—I'll see what can be done.' He hurried away, and very soon returned with candles in one hand, and the means of lighting them in the other—entered the house by raising one of the windows, and soon had the church opened, lighted, and ready for service. I preached to just one dozen hearers, and found no little help in doing so from the part he had acted.

"Through his whole course at the University, he was as much distinguished for his firmness as for his modesty, and as eminent for his piety as for his scholarship and talents. My impression is, that he established the first Sabbath school ever taught, and the first prayer meeting ever held in the University. I am sure he took a very active part in both these departments of benevolent and Christian effort.

"A few weeks before he graduated, the lamented Professor Davis said to me, with a very sad expression of countenance, 'We are about to lose Sampson; and a sad loss it will be to the University. With a modesty and reserve seldom, if ever, equalled, he combines a firmness of purpose, and an openness and energy in seeking to check evil and do good, which have made him a great blessing to the whole institution. His influence over all classes of persons is astonishing. Has your church no more such young men to send to us? The University might well afford to furnish any number of such with their board and tuition gratis.'

"I have always believed that the course he pursued and the influence he exerted contributed immensely to the great change which, from that time, began to take place in the religious character of that institution. My connection with him there ceased after some two or three months. In a pleasant interview with him just before he left, he said to me, 'I must preach the Gospel, or die in the attempt.' He left in the state of mind indicated by this remark; and you know the rest."

We cannot refrain from adding the closing paragraphs of Dr. White's remarks concerning him, though more confidential in their tone, and not relating to the subject immediately before us. His words give a touching and truthful picture of the impression made by the lovely Christian simplicity and modesty of his demeanor:

"He spent two or three days with me, and preached twice for me during the summer preceding his death. The impression he made both upon my congregation and family, was of the most salutary and pleasing kind. His meekness and gentleness, his freedom from all ostentation and reserve, won the confidence of the youngest member of my household. So much so, that for weeks and months afterwards, his visit was frequently mentioned at my fireside, as an event to be remembered with mingled emotions of pleasure and pain. With pleasure, because we enjoyed the privilege of entertaining him; and with pain, because we feared we should never enjoy this high privilege again. When this fear was realized by the announcement of his death, the deepest gloom passed over my family circle, and tears were shed that we should see his face no more."

If every pious student and other young Christian were thus

diligent in doing good, how different would be the aspect of our churches and colleges. What a new impression of the solemn reality and urgency of the work of redemption would replace in the minds of their thoughtless associates, that unreal and dreamy idea which they now entertain!

At the Union Seminary, which Dr. Sampson joined the fall after he left the University, his Christian activity was similar. No man was farther than he from that misplaced zeal, which aspires to do the work of an evangelist, while still a student, at the expense of a student's proper duties. In preparation for the class room, in punctual attention to the routine of his duties, in accurate scholarship, he was among the foremost. But to do good was one of the recreations of his leisure hours. During a season of religious interest, which visited the College in the immediate neighborhood of the Seminary, he, with others, labored much in a modest way; and some of the subjects of that work, if ever they attain to that blessed world where we believe he now is, will have occasion to acknowledge their debt to his wisdom and love, to all eternity.

As soon as he was licensed to preach the Gospel, by the Presbytery of East Hanover, he began to abound in evangelical labors, which, to his death, were increasingly accessible to the churches. Besides the labors of his vacations, in his native county, and others at a distance from the Seminary, he preached statedly at different times, in the College and Farmville churches, at Guinea in the county of Cumberland, Charlotte courthouse, Walker's, Forest and Appomattox churches in the county of Prince Edward. Some of these labors were wholly gratuitous. For a considerable period, his stated labors not being more urgently needed in any of the churches of convenient access, he preached regularly to a congregation of colored people, for no other reward than the pleasure of doing good.

Another marked trait of his Christian character was the uniformity and healthfulness of his devotional spirit. While his private habits in this matter were covered with a sacred veil, which none dared to attempt to lift—drawn alike by the reverence and the modesty of his spirit—his profiting was so outwardly evident to all, that no one could doubt his diligence in the closet. While his brief diary laments occasional spiritual declensions, there is reason to believe that he never knew what

it was to lose the assurance of hope; and that the flame of devotion burned in him with a glow unusually steady. In public, his prayers were eminently edifying to believers, marked by scriptural tone, humble sincerity, appropriateness and comprehensiveness. But to know the sweetness of his spirit of prayer fully, one must have enjoyed the privilege of being an inmate of his house and frequenting his domestic altar. Family prayers were, in his house, no hurried, unmeaning form. The whole air and tone of the exercise showed deep sincerity and earnestness. After a daily catechising of children and servants, the reading of the Word of God, and a hymn of praise, he bowed his knees with a composed awe and seriousness, which seemed to communicate itself to all the circle. What deep sincerity, what discrimination and justice, what point, what fullness, what grave tenderness characterized those prayers, as he brought before the throne of grace his household—his children, his servants, his relatives, his brethren in Christ, the Seminary, the church, and the whole interests of a perishing world! To those who were so happy as to be often present, it was not difficult to believe that these services would leave their calm and holy savor upon the spirit, throughout all the toils and cares of the day, like “the dew upon Heron, and as the dews that descended upon the mountains of Zion.”

His religious principles were strikingly illustrated also, by the manner in which he felt the call to the ministry.

As has been already indicated, his definite purpose was fixed, in this matter, during his residence at the University. It was formed in the face of the strongest influences and the most brilliant allurements to more worldly and ambitious pursuits. He has left on record the great benefit which he received in this respect, as well as in others, from the Biography of James Brainerd Taylor, edited by Dr. John H. Rice. The principles illustrated in the life of that devoted young Christian had a powerful influence in fixing his resolution to consecrate himself to the work of preaching the Gospel. But this purpose began to dawn in his soul from the very beginning of his Christian life. On one occasion the writer asked him, what were the time and means for bringing the claims of the ministry home to his conscience. He answered, “There never was a time, in my Christian life, when I did not feel the claims of the ministry.”

In reply to the question, how this was, he continued, "I simply reasoned thus: I had given myself wholly up to God, to be used for his highest glory, and if he needed me most in the work of the ministry, as seemed every way probable, as a thing of course I was bound to be a minister."

His settled purpose, during a large part of his University and Seminary course, was, to prepare himself thoroughly for the work of a translator in some important foreign mission. He was led to this purpose by his success and accuracy as a linguist, and his humble estimate of his own talents, and his capacities for public speaking. He seems to have thought that he was deficient in all those more brilliant gifts, which secure success in the pulpit; that his only talent was a patience, diligence and accuracy, which would make him a correct scholar, and that this humble talent he could best use for his master's glory, in the unobtrusive drudgery of rendering God's Word into the tongue of some Pagan people. With this object, he devoted himself most diligently to languages, drilled and cultivated his mind as thoroughly as possible in his preparatory course, and, in the Seminary, mastered as thoroughly as possible the languages of the Scriptures. But his master thought not so. When his Seminary course was but two-thirds done, he called him, by his Providence and the voice of his church, to a responsible work at home; and speedily rewarded his humble fidelity, by giving him fame and influence in the pulpit, of which he had judged himself unworthy.

Now, here is a lesson for those young Christians, who make a lack of special capacity for speaking or of similar qualifications, their pretext for declining the claims of the ministry. This servant of God had a *sincere* distrust of his own capacities; but with a heart consecrated with equal sincerity to his Saviour's service, he humbly offered himself to the work, to do what he could, believing that God would accept him according to that which he had, and not according to that which he had not. Yea, and he was accepted; and not only used his scholastic accuracy for the service of God in a high and honorable sphere, but became one of the most admired and impressive preachers of the land.

Young Christian, if thy self-distrust is genuine, go thou and do likewise. But if it is feigned, remember that "all things

are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."

Our portraiture would be recognized by all the friends of Dr. Sampson as incomplete, if we omitted those which were, to all, his most obvious traits: modesty and disinterestedness. One of his most faithful friends was accustomed to say of him, "If Brother Sampson has a fault, it is that he is too modest." This virtue was impressed upon his social demeanor, upon all his acts of conscientious decision, and upon his deportment in all the courts of the church. There, he was usually a respectful listener, and a rare and brief speaker. When his sense of the importance of a measure called him out, his remarks were direct, lucid and weighty, and offered with an air which showed that he shrunk from occupying the time and attention of the body longer than was unavoidable. Self-display and self-seeking were ideas which none that knew him associated with his name. Always estimating his own talents and knowledge below their real worth, he rather shrank from promotion than sought it. He waited for the call of his brethren and Providence; and it is believed that there never existed a case, in which he consented to lift a finger, directly or indirectly, to promote his own advancement, even by honorable means. Before he became a student of divinity, he refused very flattering offers of literary employment, not inconsistent with clerical duties. And after he engaged in the service of the Seminary, and received the assurances of his brethren that they judged his labors essential to the cause of God in that institution, no inconveniences in his post, and no advantages offered from without, weighed a feather towards leaving it. During this time, several offers of employment, such as professorships, more lucrative, and not unworthy of a Christian minister, were made to him. His answer always was, that God seemed to have work for him to do where he was; and as long as this was so, he had no right to leave it for any increase of his personal comforts or emoluments. Meantime, those emoluments were so stinted for many years, in consequence of the financial embarrassments of the Seminary, as scarcely to afford the means of comfortable subsistence. Up to his formal election to the professorship in which he died, while he performed the full duties of a professor in fact, and was acknowledged by all to be second to no one in



the value of his labors, he received less than two-thirds of the emoluments belonging to the office of a professor in this institution. This continued for ten years—years of activity, and growing reputation and usefulness—second to none of the years of his life. When he left his post temporarily, to improve his knowledge and health in Europe, the directors of the Seminary continued to him this inadequate salary during his absence—feeling that his tour was, in fact, in the service of the Seminary, and that this was no more than a just reparation for the unavoidable scantiness of his previous compensation. But even this he declined to retain, and refunded it to the Seminary after his return, in annual installments. So that the last year of his life may be said to be the only one in which he received the full salary which he had all along deserved. Yet in refunding this sum, he considered himself as repaying a debt, and not conferring a gift.

A very few years before his death he came into possession of a part of his ample patrimony, and then his benefactions increased with his ability. His donations to the Seminary and to other institutions of public interest, were bestowed with a generous hand.

His conscientiousness in the use of wealth, might well be imitated by many other Christians. Whether his circumstances were scanty or affluent, he was simple in his tastes, unostentatious in his person, and economical from principle. In accordance with the general system of all his habits, he kept an exact account of all expenditures—a thing which is, indeed, a necessary foundation for the proper practice both of Christian liberality and Christian economy. He was economical only in order to have the means to be liberal. His Christian hospitality was overflowing; and it was truly the hospitality of a Christian minister, designed not for its own display, but for the bestowal of comfort on others. To every good cause he gave, always with the heart, and when his means became ample, with the hand of a prince. It was one of the secrets which his Christian modesty never revealed, that he kept a strict account between himself and God, in which all sources of income were stated with scrupulous exactness, and a fixed and liberal portion of the sum was set apart to almsgiving; and this account was balanced with as much regularity as his bank book. Mean-

time, he was not without the pretext, which many professors of religion find for stinting their liberality, in the claims of a growing family.

---

### CHAPTER III.

Dr. Sampson as a Student. Wise and Resolute Plan. Thoroughness. Intense Application. His Scholarship—Its Range and Accuracy.

The third general topic proposed to the reader, will be the habits of study and scholarship of Dr. Sampson. A brief statement of his methodical and thorough system of study has already been made. It may perhaps be said with truth, that the only peculiar indication of *talent*, which the beginning of his scholastic life gave, was the wise and resolute plan of study which he set before himself, and pursued from the first, with all the determination of his character. For surely, such wise determination is a talent—it is a trait of mental and moral greatness—and one rare and invaluable in a stripling of sixteen. He seems to have begun his collegiate course with a fixed reference to the greatest ultimate benefit. While he was a most punctual and laborious student, exact in all collegiate duties, allowing himself, for years, only six hours in bed, and but a scanty season for recreation, he did not fall into the temptation which overthrows so many at the University of Virginia. This is the ambition to run rapidly over the course, by an extraordinary and spasmodic exertion, and thereby to excite admiration, and to pass speedily into the duties of active life. Dr. Sampson's course, on the contrary, was long and deliberate, covering five years. Many distinguished citizens, who were his fellow students, state that he was at first only known as "an excellent student," of good sense and accurate habits; but that with every session, the appreciation of his abilities and learning increased. He seems to have practiced, from the first, the wisdom so rare in youth, of leaving nothing behind unmastered, of never weakening the accuracy of his faculties and perceptions by half prepared tasks, and half understood views. His scholarship was matured and digested, as he progressed. And this character was found eminently in all his subsequent acqui-

tions. It has been said that, as a Seminary student, he showed equal diligence and method. As a professor, his diligence was great, and his toil in study excessive, until increasing infirmities compelled him to relax his labors. It is well remembered by some of his pupils, that once, when taking a class over the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he had gone over more than once before, he spent, on an average, thirty hours of active study on each lesson, in additional preparation. But alas! here the intensity of his zeal reached its crisis. This was the last year of his firm, unbroken health; and henceforth, "while the spirit was willing, the flesh was weak."

If all our young ministry was inspired with such zeal, how glorious would be the result? Perhaps the number might be increased by those who, like our lamented brother, would have to say of themselves, "The zeal of thy house hath consumed me," and whose premature loss the church would bemoan just as their harvest of usefulness was beginning. But would not this spirit endue the ministry of reconciliation with an influence, a weight, a might, a glory, which would be cheaply purchased, even at so precious a cost? A costly price hath our Zion paid for this example, which she now offers to her young ministers, to teach them what is the diligence they should exercise! May God forbid that it should be lost on them. Happy is that man who falls at the high noon of his career, and on the spring tide of his success, at his post of duty; but happier is he who can so temper a burning activity with a holy prudence, and so avoid both a corroding sluggishness and a rash over exertion, as to rise brightly to the meridian of his powers, and then decline gently towards their serene evening, and thus to bless the church both with his earlier strength and his riper experience.

By such system and diligence, Dr. Sampson became one of the best educated men of our country. In all the departments of letters he was able, above the average. His knowledge of systematic theology was profound and extensive. Of church history he retained a knowledge far superior to that which most young ministers bring to their ordination, although his department called him away from these studies; and he was accustomed to complain that his memory was treacherous with regard to those of its stores which he had no opportunity to re-

view. His mastery of Latin and Greek, and of most of the polite languages of modern Europe, would have abundantly qualified him for the highest posts of instruction in America. To say that it was such as becomes a well educated minister, would be utterly inadequate to the truth. But his ripest acquirements were in the Hebrew literature and the exposition of the Scripture. Here, as is well known, he was pre-eminent for thoroughness, accuracy and philosophical arrangement. While there may be many who possess an equal familiarity with these departments of learning, it may be safely asserted that, as a *teacher* of Hebrew, there was not his superior on our continent.

---

#### CHAPTER IV.

Characteristics as a Teacher. Tact. Vivacity. Earnestness. Patience  
Intercourse with Pupils. Hebrew Prelections.

This naturally suggests another subject of remark—his character as an instructor. In his practical skill as a teacher, was his peculiar value to the church of our day; for as a master of the art of communicating knowledge, he was, in our view, unrivaled. It was not that his lectures presented those grand sayings which electrify for the moment, nor that any one of his efforts produced on the pupil an impress of pre-eminent talent—but there was just the combination of that justness of mind, steady animation, thorough knowledge, patience and tact, which gave the highest skill in teaching, both as it is a trade and as it is a science. He was equal to its profoundest researches. He shunned none of its most irksome drudgeries. One of the foundation stones of his success was his own indisputable scholarship. No man ever passed through one of his classes without a profound and admiring conviction of this. Another was in his unfailing animation and vivacity of mind, which was so keen, even on subjects usually esteemed dry, as to seem unaccountable to many. The exertion of voice and body, which he unconsciously employed, when thoroughly warmed to his work, was often the subject of playful remark between him and his colleagues. This animation communicated itself to his pupils—so that usually their highest diligence was exerted in his department, though it was one not most at-

tractive to all minds. But to this result another quality, which is invaluable to the teacher, also contributed. This was the energy of his own will, which pressed on towards the objects of his exertion with an impetus which swept all along with it, and communicated its own life to the most sluggish. In every act of his in the class room, there was expressed the idea of work; and all who frequented it soon felt instinctively that it was not the place for loitering. It might be said that his watchword was *thoroughness*. With an admirable patience, he expounded his subject so as to make it luminous to the weakest eye; and if his questions revealed the fact that there was still some one who did not fully comprehend, he would resume his explanation, and repeat in varied forms, till his ideas were thoroughly mastered. Out of this habit, and the propensity of his mind to thorough work, probably grew that which might have been considered his prominent fault as an instructor. His explanations sometimes degenerated into excessive amplification, which became wearisome to those who had given him a moderate degree of attention from the beginning; and he thus unduly protracted his prelections.

His intercourse with his pupils was marked by a happy union of modest dignity, which repelled improper encroachments, and cordial, ingenuous kindness, which conciliated confidence. In his presence, each one felt that there was a simplicity and candor which set the stamp of reality on every kind of attention. It is believed that there is not one of his pupils who did not feel for him not only respect, but warm affection; and many can join in the sad words of one who remarked, when speaking of his death, "Well, I never expect to meet with another minister of the Gospel, whom I shall love and revere as I did that man." Often it was a subject of wonder to his colleagues, how so much affection could be retained from those towards whom he exercised so much fidelity in admonishing.

The distinctive traits of his expository instructions may perhaps be described as justice of thought, neatness, and impartiality of mind. He believed the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. His soul loved their spiritual truths; and often in the lecture room he soared away from the dry dissection of words and propositions, into regions of devout meditation, and made his class forget for the time the exercises of the head, in the nobler exercises of the heart.

It was in his Hebrew prelections that his mental excellence shone most distinctly. He had applied the broadest principles of etymology to the elements of this language, in a manner original and philosophical; and had thus reduced them to an order which, so far as we know, is not equaled by any published grammar. His lectures unfolded the Hebrew etymology with a lucid order, beauty and simplicity, which could not fail to delight every intelligent learner. Indeed, if we may be permitted to introduce our own judgment, after frequenting the halls of three separate institutions of learning, and sitting under some of the most gifted and learned men who have appeared on this side of the Atlantic, Dr. Sampson's lectures on the Hebrew language, and some other departments, seem to us the most philosophical, the most complete, *the best teaching* to which we ever listened. None who attended his prelections on the canon of Scripture (of which there remains a brief specimen in his "University Lecture") will forget the masterly nature of the argument there constructed. It is one not servilely copied or compiled from previous writers, but constructed on his own plan. He has there built, upon a foundation of adamant, a structure whose ribs of steel are knit together with the strength of mathematical demonstration. No part is wanting, and every part is in its exact place. It stands *totus teres et rotundus*, impenetrable everywhere to refutation.

Alas! that there remain no permanent records of most of these invaluable instructions, except in the scanty and scattered notes of his pupils. In his later years, Dr. Sampson regretted often that he had not found time to fix upon paper more of his course of instruction. But such was his unambitious and self-sacrificing spirit, that he always yielded to the urgent demands of the present, and preferred the thorough performance of his duties to his classes, to the gathering of those fruits of his researches, which would have promoted the fame of his authorship. He said, that if he became an author, he must be a less diligent teacher. There was not time to be, thoroughly, both at once. And he preferred rather to leave his record written on the minds and hearts of the rising ministry of our Synods, where it might be fruitful in the enlightening of souls, than in volumes which would hand down his name to future ages. But besides this, he was cut down just when the fruits of his

arduous studies were coming to their rich maturity. Had he lived to old age, he might have gathered some of them into books, for the benefit of a wider and more remote circle.

---

## CHAPTER V.

Dr. Sampson as a Preacher. Simplicity of Style. Logical Arrangement. Elevation of Thought. Steadily advancing Reputation. Lesson of Encouragement to young Divines.

The reader will almost be able to surmise, from what has now been said, the character of his preaching. It exhibited always the lucid order, and the animation of mind which marked everything which he produced. His best sermons rose to a grade of excellence which is seldom displayed in any part of the church. And it was an excellence which was most appreciated by the most cultivated and mature minds. Whilst there were other preachers, who would be more sought after by the masses, he was preferred by the men of thought and acquirement. His plans of discussion were marked by a just and comprehensive view, which showed both the profound theologian, and the ripe biblical scholar, who had drunk deep into the spirit of the Word of God. His propositions were usually stated with singular accuracy and beauty of language; but it was a beauty rather logical than theoretical, rather chaste than florid. In deed, his whole method of discussion wore an appearance of directness, too severe to admit of any license of ornament. Yet, in the judgment of all those who are capable of appreciating a felicitous purity and aptness of language, and thoughts of vigorous symmetry, many passages in his sermons rose to the highest grade of eloquence, coupled as they were with his genuine fervor and fire. His preaching was rich in matter, and eminently scriptural, such as is best fitted to feed the spiritual mind. It was always remarkable for its elegance and elevation, which were never tarnished by anything coarse in allusion, ludicrous in association, or bungling in structure. But it was, the least of all men's, a finical elegance. It was rather that of an energetic and lofty simplicity. That men of strictly scholastic training and pursuits should excel in the particular work of

the pulpit, is rather the exception; but he was certainly one of the most brilliant of these exceptions. By the intelligent public his preaching was even as highly esteemed as his professional labors were by intelligent students.

This fact is dwelt on, because it contains most instructive encouragement to all beginners in the pulpit work. When Dr. Sampson first began to preach, he was far from being an easy or impressive speaker. His first attempts had little to commend them, except that excellence of composition which was the unavoidable result of his thorough training and good mind. He labored under a constraint and embarrassment, painful to himself and his hearers. His voice was not modulated, and his gesture was scant and unformed. But every effort showed improvement; and a few years of diligent exertion placed him in the front rank of impressive, pungent and fervent pulpit orators. His voice became resonant and musical; his action dignified and energetic.

Such an example should effectually remove the discouragements of those who suppose they are deficient in pulpit gifts; and it should teach all to feel their responsibility to set up for themselves a high standard of excellence, and to be satisfied with no dull mediocrity in sacred oratory. Provided they have good sense and diligence, let them not persuade themselves that the road is closed up to them, which leads to the higher grades of excellence in this art. The things by which Dr. Sampson was enabled so thoroughly to overcome his original defects, were undoubtedly these: First, there was his superior scholarship, which gave him mental furniture, and supplied the best material upon which to build a style. Had he not been a superior scholar, had his mind not been thoroughly drilled and invigorated by its inner training, his early manner would never have been improved into one so eminently good. Next, should be mentioned the modesty, humility and ingenuousness of his Christian character. He learned to preach well, because he aimed to preach not himself, but Jesus Christ. Those words of our Saviour proved strictly true, in their application to his understanding of the art of expressing religious truth: "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." His eye was single. His prevailing purpose was to show forth the way of life: and his taste was not perverted,



nor his manner poisoned, by the itchings of conceit, or the ambition for display. And, in the third place, he was diligent. Not only did he preach much, "in season and out of season," but he preached with careful and laborious preparation. And where there is a natural substratum of good sense, unfettered by any physical defect, these means will usually be sufficient to overcome any amount of incipient difficulties or failures, and to make any man, if not an orator of the first rank, an impressive and pleasing speaker.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

Intellectual Traits. Genius and Talent. Symmetry. Analytic Faculty. Imagination. Memory. Candid Estimate of his Powers.

It is in the life and acts of a man that the faculties and traits of his mind make themselves known to others. Consequently, the preceding exhibition of Dr. Sampson's character as a scholar, teacher and preacher, is also a portraiture, in some sense, of his intellect. No more is necessary, therefore, than to sum up the whole with a few general remarks. Dr. Sampson could not be called a genius. He was what is far better—a man of high talent. His mind presented nothing that was salient or astonishing. But this was not so much because there was not power, as because it was power symmetrically developed. His was just one of those excellent minds, which grow most, and longest, by good cultivation. In wide and adventurous range, his speculative powers were not equal to those of some other men; but in power of correct analysis, in soundness of judgment and logical perspicacity, he was superior to all we have ever known, except a very few. Indeed, when a speculative subject was fully spread out before his mind for consideration, his conclusions seemed to be guided by a penetration and justness of thought almost infallible. This consideration was deliberate; and his decision was very rarely expressed with haste, or even with promptitude. Hence his writings and conversation never exhibited any of that paradox, or that bold novelty and dangerous originality, which are too often mistaken for greatness. His talents, if they had less to

awaken an empty astonishment and admiration, were far safer, more reliable and more useful. It was hard for anything so phistical or unsatisfactory to escape detection under his steady gaze. He was particularly free from that common fault of many minds of large grasp: the adopting of major propositions so large that they will contain the conclusion which the reasoner desires to derive from them; but at the same time so shadowy that they contain he knows not how much more.

In his powers of arrangement, he was undoubtedly superior to any man we have ever known. In his mind, the elements of thought seemed to group themselves always, and spontaneously, into the most philosophical order possible, with a regularity like that of the atoms of limpid water, when they crystalize into transparent ice.

The efforts of Dr. Sampson's imagination were rather of that kind which Mr. Macaulay describes in Sir James Macintosh. They consisted not so much in the original grouping of elements into new, but lifelike forms, as in selecting appropriate forms already shaped out, from the stores of a well furnished memory. In those severer exercises of the imagination, which are required in mathematical thought and in the bodying forth of scientific conceptions, this faculty was eminently distinct and vigorous. But in its more poetic exercises it was limited. His power of calling up that species of illustration which is flowing and graceful, was scanty; and while the operations of his faculties, especially in lecturing and preaching, were unusually fervent, it was rather, so far as it was not spiritual, the dry heat, if we may so term it, of intellectual animation, than the glow of genial fancies. And yet, there were a few occasions on which he showed a high measure of the graphic or pictorial power; which might indicate that this faculty was rather disused by him than lacking in him. Another of his mental peculiarities has been already hinted: his almost impracticable honesty. He could never be induced to accept a proposition unless it wholly commended itself to his mind as true. His memory was most retentive, for all things which were arranged in it by any logical association; but for things sole, or merely verbal, it was sometimes treacherous.

Upon the whole, considering the admirable justness and perspicacity of his mind, its vigor and accuracy in analysis, its

wonderful capacity for philosophical arrangement, and the energy of its purposes, he might have been truthfully called a man of great powers. The symmetry of those powers, his modesty in their display, the very accuracy of thought which repressed all those paradoxical brilliancies that catch the admiration of the crowd, forbid that he should be promptly appreciated. Hence his proper grade will probably only be assigned him by those who, like the writer, had opportunities to contemplate his mental powers deliberately. But it is his deliberate judgment—a judgment formed maturely, in advance of that warm personal attachment which he will ever esteem one of the chief blessings and honors of his life, that Dr. Sampson, for his particular work, possessed capacities unsurpassed by any man which our country has produced, and equaled by very few. Happy would it have been for our churches if they had fully known his worth.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

Failure of Health. Fluctuations of Disease. Flattering Hopes. Increased Diligence. Dr. Sampson's last Sermon. Final Attack. Concern of the whole Community. Prayer in Presbytery. Dying Exercises.

In the early spring of 1846, Dr. Sampson's ill health began with a terrible pleurisy; which was immediately provoked by fatigue and exposure in preaching the Gospel, but doubtless owed its more remote origin to the prostration of vital energy, produced by the intense application we have described above. After imminently threatening his life, this disease was subdued, but it did not leave him with a sound constitution. He seemed to be nearly re-established: and especially, on his return from Europe, his appearance of health and vivacity allayed all the fears of his friends. But not long after, he experienced another irreparable shock, in a severe nervous fever which overtook him on a journey. This left him with a nervous system and liver painfully deranged, and some threatening indications of pulmonary disease. From this time forth, he seldom knew what it was to enjoy comfortable strength. His most

distressing symptoms were a feverish excitability of pulse, sleeplessness, and occasional attacks of biliary derangement, which prostrated his muscular system for the time. But during his last session, his health, cheerfulness and hopefulness seemed to revive; and there was again a flattering promise of re-established strength and a long life. The returning prosperity of the beloved Seminary, the renewed and substantial assurances of interest and affection on the part of the churches and ministry, and the steps taken towards filling the vacancies in its faculty and dividing his responsibilities, seemed to be cordials to his mind and body. His enjoyment of the innocent blessings of life and its domestic affections, was intense, and his hold upon it was strong.

During this flattering season, he seemed to be conscientiously husbanding his strength, and employing all the means for preserving health. Once or twice he referred to the repeated and grievous blows, which a mysterious Providence had inflicted on the Seminary in the death of its most useful servants, and pleasantly said to his colleagues, "It is our duty to live just as long as we can, in order that the institution may have time to root itself." But alas! another blast was nearer than any of us feared, which shook its still unsettled strength, not less grievously than any which has burst upon it, since that which smote down its great founder in the flower of his strength and success. Nor did Dr. Sampson seem to be without anticipations of its approach. While he said nothing directly, and seemed rather to avoid any allusions to the previous symptoms, threatening his health, as a painful subject, yet the thought seemed to be ever treading close after his eager footsteps, and spurring him to greater diligence, "The night cometh, when no man can work." More than once, when others expostulated with him for taxing himself beyond his strength, either by the fervency of his preaching, or the vigor with which he pushed through his Seminary duties, he answered, "Perhaps I have but a few days or weeks more in which to do my task. I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day."

And even so, the summons came, to him not unawares, but to us "like a thunderbolt from a cloudless sky." Sunday, the second of April, the venerable pastor being absent, he preached in the college church, from Prov. xi, 18. "The wicked

worketh a deceitful work; but to him that soweth righteousness, shall be a sure reward." In this sermon he urged the contrast between the delusiveness of the objects pursued by the unbeliever, and the glorious sufficiency and certainty of the believer's reward, with a power of thought, an energy of manner, and a fervor of affection, which could not have been surpassed, if he had foreseen that this was his last message to his fellow men, and had poured the whole soul of a dying man into this final appeal. As we left the church that day, we felt that in this discourse his powers as a preacher of the gospel culminated. From that meridian height and splendor he fell—nay, rather, he rose; for the next Lord's day his soul (doubtless) ascended to those heavenly courts,

"Where congregations ne'er break up,  
And Sabbaths have no end."

After attending with zest upon all the religious services of the day, he retired to rest, apparently in his usual health—his last act having been to minister to the comfort of a sick servant. Before the next morning he was violently seized with what seemed at first to be one of the customary bilious attacks; but it proved a fatal and insidious pneumonia. Perhaps it was the more fatal, because he was providentially deprived of the assistance of his faithful family physician for nearly twenty-four hours after his first attack. When he first secured medical aid, his symptoms were most ominous; and after one or two delusive promises of relaxation, the disease finished its deadly work on Sabbath, April the 9th. His shattered frame had not the springs of an effectual resistance, and succumbed soon before a malady which is terrible even to the strongest.

The Wednesday after he was seized, West Hanover Presbytery convened at Brown's church, Cumberland, about fifteen miles from the Seminary. Perhaps the last business act which Dr. Sampson performed was one eminently characteristic of his punctuality. It was to send, by one of his colleagues, his excuse for absence from Presbytery, and a business paper of some importance to a third person, which he directed, with a special charge, to be placed without fail in the hands of the moderator. When the Presbytery learned his threatening condition, it proceeded at once to set apart a season of special in-

tercession on his behalf. Highly as he had been appreciated by his brethren before, when they began to look in the face the consequences of his loss, they seemed to awaken to a new sense of his value to the Seminary and the church. On Friday, and again on Saturday, when persons were recognized approaching the church, who were known to come direct from him, the house was almost deserted by the members, who came out, by an irrepressible impulse, to learn his state. Friday, when it was reported that there was a faint promise of amendment, it was agreed that the Presbytery should again unite in a season of intercession on his behalf; and prayer was offered, by the revered pastor of the College church, with a faith, tenderness, fervency and devout submission, which will never be forgotten to the dying day of those who heard it. Could such a prayer fail to enter into the ears of the *Lord of Sabaoth*? Doubtless it *was* heard and accepted; accepted even as that more bitter cry of our divine Exemplar was accepted: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." "It is enough for the disciple to be as his Master." In all the congregations which received the news of our brother's danger, prayer was also made of the church unto God for him. The anxiety of the whole community concerning him revealed that he had a hold upon their respect and affections, which would not have been expected, if we remembered that his pursuits had been chiefly those of the study, and that he was rather among the people than of them. Persons going from the Seminary were everywhere stopped in the road by enquirers after his condition, in which there was a deep concern and tenderness, which came from the heart.

His religious exercises were just those of which his Christian life gave promise—without fear, for he had long lived in the assurance of hope; and without transport, for a disease so violent and prostrating left no animal spirits for such feelings, foreign as they were at all times, to his religious habits. Early in his sickness, but after his disease had manifested itself as a dangerous one, he remarked to one of his nurses, "I find now, what I have always felt, that a sick bed is no place to prepare for eternity. But I have not *that* to do. I long ago made my peace with God. The God I have feebly preached to others is my support."

His disease, attacking as it did the lungs, made talking both painful and injurious; and he and all about him were strongly inhibited by the physicians to converse much. He yielded an implicit obedience, remarking several times, "My life belongs not to myself, but to the church, the Seminary, my family, and to society; and it is my duty now not to consult my own inclinations, but conscientiously to observe the means of preserving life, as long as there is any hope." Indeed, he seemed to study calmness of emotions, and even to avert his mind from those objects which would excite the more near domestic affections, which were, to one blessed as he was, so tender, and in the prospect of their interruption, so harrowing. Thus he observed the means of life with the same composed, conscientious principle with which he had usually addressed himself to any other duty.

During the later and more decisive assaults of his disease, reason at times wavered on her seat. In his lucid moments he complained that his mind was filled with a teeming multitude of thoughts, new, varied, strange—some of them perplexed and troublous, some luminous and interesting. May it not be that this was the strife between the bedimming, enervating dominion of the flesh on the one hand, and the dawnings of that nobler life to which the spirit rises when it bursts from the mortal coil, on the other; and as the doubtful tide of combat rolled to and fro, the shadows of earth-born dimness and confusion were alternating with gleams of Heaven's own light over his soul?

In these seasons the influence of his predominant tastes and pursuits was strongly visible. His mind was busy with the Word of God, expounding, or investigating its treasures in the original tongues.

Three days before his death he said, "It seems to me that all the difficult passages of Scripture I have ever investigated are present to my eye now, in Greek, Hebrew, or Chaldee, and all clamoring for settlement. But I tell them all, Go away, I am sick, and cannot attend to you." The last of these seasons of wandering was the morning of the Lord's day on which he died. During this he said to one of his nurses, "See that wall—it is all written over with Scripture promises; and they are in letters so large that I can read them every one." It was an-

swered, "Oh no, there is nothing there, except the plastering." But he persisted, "Yes—they are there—cannot I see them? Lay your head here, beside mine, and then you will see them plain." She wishing to hegule him into more composure said, "Oh, don't think of these things—shut your eyes, and try to be quiet." "Why," replied he, "may I not read them? I know it is the Sabbath; hut they are all Sunday reading—they are all from the Scripture."

Now, whence were those characters, invisible to all others, hut so distinct to his failing eye-sight? Doubtless, they were recalled from the stores of recollection, where they had lain hid, apparently lost to himself, by a memory stimulated into preternatural activity, either by the approach of the spirit's release from material bonds, or by the inexplicable influence of disease. And now the vivid conception was so bodied forth to the mind's eye, in the season of excitement, as to seem to him actually pictured on the diseased retina, where the real images of the external world were fading dimly into darkness. And thus the walls were covered, to his eye, with the ample scrolls of a memory enriched by years of study. How mercifully does God deal with his children? Here it was so ordered, that those hours, which, in our apprehensions, we only think of as filled with anguish and fear, were heguled with the contemplation of those sacred truths which had been his delight in health. And is there not here another illustration of that theory which seems so like truth—that every impression ever made on the memory, though it may seem to us obliterated, is still there, and will some day be revived, that man's soul is hut a fearful "*Palimpsest*,"\* where the earlier records are only in seeming, removed to make way for the later, and all the labyrinthine history will stand out in letters of light, genial or lurid, to be re-read by the soul in eternity.

But after this, Dr. Sampson became more composed, and his self-possession returned completely; nor did it leave him again till the last moment. The strife between the powers of life and disease was decided; pain ceased, and he gently passed away. A few hours before the closing scene, his children were placed around his bed side, to receive his last words: hut the

---

\*DeQuincey.



effort to speak to them was so laborious, that at the suggestion of one of the physicians, he relinquished it. After they retired, he said with the most extreme difficulty, gasping a word at a time in whispers, between his labored respirations: "I had some things which I wished to say to them; but perhaps it is most wisely ordered that I should not say them. They know how I have lived. I have always taught them that God's Word is the only supreme rule of life. They have that—and it is enough. Perhaps they might have put my last words before God's Word." This was the last connected sentence he spoke.

How could he, whose business was to expound the Sacred Scriptures, have closed his life more appropriately, than with such an acquiescence in their complete sufficiency—coming as it did from the heart of a dying father?

Thus he quietly passed away, about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The following Tuesday, he was borne to the grave, in the Seminary burying ground, by the hands of his pupils, and in the presence of a multitude, every one of whom seemed a sincere mourner.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

Practical Teachings of such a Life. Reward of Patience and Faith. Humility crowned with Honor. The Price of great Usefulness. Home Institutions must be sustained. Men of deep toned Piety and profound Scholarship demanded.

And here we should end our task, if we listened only to the promptings of our own feelings—leaving this life and this death to speak for themselves. But it is necessary that we should endeavor to enforce, more pointedly, a few of the impressive lessons which Providence has taught us in giving, and then taking, such a man. Of the appeal which his example speaks to the pious youth of our churches, to devote themselves wholly to God, of the loss which the Seminary and the Presbyterian church has sustained, of the darkness of this act of her head, and of the duty of implicit trust in the righteousness of his mysterious dealings, nothing will be said.

But looking back to the source of Dr. Sampson's Christian life, in the holy example, prayers and instructions of the Rev. Thornton Rogers, we see a delightful illustration of the truth, that "he which converteth the sinner from the error of his ways," not only "saveth a soul from death, but hideth a multitude of sins." When that good man labored in faith for the salvation of his irreligious pupil, he little knew what he was doing. His thought was to pluck him from perdition, and to make him a Christian, possibly an humble minister. He did not know that he was instrumentally contributing the most essential part towards the raising up of a master in Israel, whose steady and benign light was to be a blessing to two great commonwealths, and whose Christian virtues were to be reproduced in many scores of pastors, many of them, in their turn, pillars in the church, and fountains of an influence, national in its extent! Nor do we know, when we endeavor to do good, with how glorious a result our generous Master may reward us. Let us, then, not be weary in well doing. Mr. Rogers died in the prime of his life, and his friends mourned over the mystery of such a stroke upon such a man, as we have lately over the loss of his more eminent pupil. But, if his ministerial life had resulted in nothing else but the gift of one such man to the church, would it not have been a sufficient result?

Again. The weakness of our faith often staggers at sacrifices of worldly good to be made, and difficulties to be encountered, in the path of duty. Let all to whom the voice of God comes, learn by the example of our brother, to dismiss these fears, and trust the united command and promise, "Trust in the Lord and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." It was required of Dr. Sampson, in order to become a minister of the Gospel, to relinquish, apparently, the direct road to wealth and distinction. In following the beck of his master, he was compelled to brave many obstacles, and face threatening privations. But they were, at last, little more than threats. By the divine blessing on his own economy and industry, he was able at all times to surround himself, and those dear to him, with the comforts and decencies of life; and these increased ultimately to an ample competency. His temporal life knew no real want; and there

was no actual sacrifice of that external comfort with which unbelief would have scared him from his duty. And after all—in seeking the testimony of a good conscience towards God, he found that distinction which he had not sought; he gratified his friends by winning a far higher social position than that which he seemed to relinquish to serve God; and became the ornament and pride of his family. Let no man be afraid to trust God.

We find in the foregoing history also, a beautiful example of the honor which comes to true humility. If there was one moral trait pre-eminent in Dr. Sampson, it was modesty. The desire for self-display seemed to be foreign to his nature. He ever thought others better than himself. He never schemed or planned for promotion, but was guided by a magnanimous and elevated delicacy, which refused to lift a finger, even by any honorable competition, to secure distinction for himself. And in every public position, on the floor of every church court, his humility shrank from that prominence to which his wisdom entitled him. But while, with a single eye, forgetful of self, he was taking care of his Master's interests, that Master took care of his reputation. Though his position was one of scholastic privacy, and his talents were rather solid than brilliant, he steadily grew upon the appreciation of his brethren, until his early death found him enjoying a confidence, love and admiration, solid and extensive enough to satisfy any ambition. Where is the man, of only thirty-nine years, within the limits of the whole Presbyterian church, whose death would now leave a gap harder to be filled, or excite a sorrow more general and sincere?

While our brother sought out the lowest seat, God said to him, and the church repeated, "Go up higher." Would that this example might seal upon the heart of every young minister in our church the lesson, "Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Would that all the unworthy arts of an unsanctified ambition were as unknown in the church as they were in the conduct of this pure, Christian gentleman. They are as foolish and suicidal as they are unworthy.

The results of Dr. Sampson's life and labors present a painful—yea, almost a cruel illustration of the evils which have

more than once flowed from the tardy and partial co-operation, extended by our churches at the South, to their own public institutions. Here were industry, talents and acquirements that would have been sought after and valued by the largest theological schools in the land. Believing that God's providence pointed him to Union Seminary as his post, he poured out the riches of his mental treasures in her service. And to purchase what? Was it a worthy result of such a life, or a sufficient recompense for such an expenditure, to train a body of pupils, ranging, during the sixteen years of his labors, from eleven to twenty? Let us not be misunderstood. We know that, intrinsically, the training of one true minister—yea, the salvation of one soul, is worth the whole labors of an army of the most learned divines during their whole life. And were there but the one soul in the world, liable to perdition, it would be the part of sober wisdom to expend all of this labor in its behalf alone. But while the field is so vast, and so white to the harvest, and opportunities for doing good open so immeasurably before the eye of Christian enterprise, it is a waste to expend, for a very few, labors and talents which might elsewhere have blessed a multitude. We may securely ask this question, Suppose that the warmest friends of Union Seminary in 1838, being also the true friends of Dr. Sampson and of Christ's cause, could have foreseen that he had just sixteen precious years to labor; that he would soon attain such eminent capacities for his work; and that in spite of his acknowledged abilities, the lack of hearty co-operation and wise and seasonable effort on the part of others, would cabin and confine his field of usefulness to this narrow bound—would they themselves have been willing, would they have dared, to urge him to make the unequal sacrifice? A regard to the interests of Christ's kingdom would have forbidden it. They would have said, "We dare not selfishly expend so much, for so small a result. The field is the world. Let him go where, being better sustained, he can effect something larger for his Master." But they hoped better things for their own enterprise; and hoping, they honestly invited him to enlist in that important cause, in which they were sincerely struggling. He obeyed the call. He toiled on, hoping against hope, with magnanimous self-devotion; and most likely, sacrificed not only his labors, but his life, an expenditure

partially useless, in endeavoring to bear his unequal burden. And now, after the catastrophe, as his friends stand over the grave of so much that was noble in morals, wise in understanding and vigorous in action, they feel a regret, cruel, yea, immedicable, except by the submissiveness of faith, that his precious life was, in part, spent in vain. Not in vain, thank God! as to *his* reward, nor useless as to those indirect results, which, we trust, the wisdom and grace of God will bring out of his labors and example. But he was permitted to reap but a part of those abundant fruits which such labors should have earned, in his own life time, in such a country and such an age as ours. And this regret is ever embittered by the symptoms of returning prosperity and extending usefulness, which now appear in his darling institution. How touching the fate, that after sixteen years of toil, and hopes deferred, he was snatched away, just as the smiles of success began to gladden his heart! But here, our regret is softened by the thought, that he has entered upon a reward of his labors far sweeter than that of a visible success.

But this is not the first (would that it might be the last) instance, in which our people have been half aroused by a partial sense of our social necessities, so as to set on foot some weak and half endowed effort for their supply. And then they supinely relax, and even make the half starved weakness of those institutions which they call their own, and whose ill success is their own loss and shame, the pretext for bestowing their indolent and heedless favors on foreign institutions, which are flourishing and popular because their natural owners and supporters, with a wiser forecast and energy, stood by them in their weakness. Meantime, those nobler spirits, who have been thrust forward into the breach, and whose clearer vision sees the vital importance of home enterprises to all our vital interests, wear away the springs of life, in a generous but useless sacrifice. And meantime the commonwealth, for the lack of these home institutions, lags farther and farther in the rear, and sends forth her money, her sons, her energies, her life blood, to fecundate the soils and adorn the fame of rival states! Must a hecatomb of her noblest lives be immolated, before the slumbering spirit of Virginia will awake to know and embrace her own interests?

But yet, as long as there is hope of Virginia, that "she is not dead, but sleepeth," let her sons hear the voice which demands that they shall be satisfied with none but the highest acquirements. In the example which we have been contemplating, the young ministers of our church may see the importance, and the solemn obligation of aiming at the highest standard of theological learning. If the church, if our Synods, would retain their respectability and influence, they must have a reserved corps of men, whose well-trained faculties, wide scholarship, and elevated character, will fit them to step at once into any of our places of trust and responsibility. Otherwise, we are reduced to one of two equally mortifying and ruinous alternatives, to commit those responsible posts to ill-furnished and incompetent men, who will betray the influence and character of our enterprises, in this age of honorable competition and vigorous progress in all other sections of our land, or else go begging to other sections, to get such men as they can afford to spare us. Have these Synods such a body of reserved talent and learning now? If the valuable men, who now fill the professorships and presidencies of our Presbyterian Colleges and State Universities, were removed by death, could the Synods point with confidence to sons of theirs, and tell them to step into the breaches, and account them fitted to take up the fallen mantles? If the chairs of our Seminary were vacated, would or would not the Synods be at fault, in their search for successors, to whom they could confidently commit those important posts? When Dr. Sampson fell prematurely, did they feel that it was easy to find many men in their borders, from among whom to select his successor?

It is not necessary that these questions be answered here. There may be an evil in the church far more portentous than a stinted supply of ministers. It is that which comes, when her younger ministry are satisfied with those more shallow attainments, which secure them a modicum of popular applause and favor, indolently recline upon the dependence of a facile and plausible pulpit talent, and relax those severer studies, by which the profound scholar is formed. It is an evil which strikes at the root of our prosperity, and when it prevails, can only be repaired at the root, and therefore, repaired tediously. For these

surface men cannot even reproduce their kind, sorry as is their kind, and the general prevalence of such a type of ministerial acquirement renders inevitable a subsequent dearth of even second rate ministers, and a state of starveling dependence on other sections.

We therefore beseech our young brethren, as for our life, to imitate the noble example which God has mercifully given our Zion in our lost brother, and to resolve that they will be satisfied with nothing short of the fullest development of faculties, the soundest acquirements, and the most scriptural, humble and manly piety, which are within the reach of the most sustained diligence. This is no less the command of duty, than of a sanctified ambition. We are to love and serve God with all our heart, and mind, and strength, and soul. We are partially guilty of burying our talents, unless we prepare ourselves to meet the highest exigencies which are within the possibilities of our natural gifts.

In the life of Dr. Sampson, we see how directly that kind of scholarship which is usually esteemed least practical in a minister of the gospel, an extensive acquaintance with oriental literature, was made to subserve the interests of the church—yea, how immediately and necessarily those interests would have suffered, for the lack of them.

If there is one thing proved by an experience of some twenty-five years, it is, that none but first rate men can now effectually subserve the institutions and interests of these Synods, in their prominent posts. To secure so many such men as they will need, there must be a liberal number, especially among their younger ministry, capable of the greatest things, from among whom they may choose. We do not expect to find plants of tallest and most vigorous growth among the few untimely shoots which spring up here and there in the season of wintry sterility. We expect to find them all puny, for the same reason which makes them few. And if one is found truly vigorous, it is a true *lusus naturae*. We look for the full grown plant amidst the teeming abundance of the fruitful summer, and in the thickest part of a thick and emulous crop.

Unless we have, then, such a body of noble men, "whose hearts God hath touched," we do not say our cause is lost, but we say that success, worthy of the cause, is impossible. The

church expects every man to be the greatest he can be. She needs men who have begun, in the first place, by laying the foundation of a thorough and full academical course, which entirely transcends that scanty range of scholarship which is too often the limit of our collegiate courses; or else, if this is lacking, men who have repaired the lack by the herculean exertions of later years. Then, they must be men who superadd to this not only such a theological training as will pass them creditably through Presbyteries, and suffice for the making of genteel little sermons, but a thorough and ever widening knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures, and the doings and doctrines of the great masters of theology in all ages. They must also be men free from trivial but odious tricks of personal indulgence or weakness—men, whose directness of aim, whose humble dignity of character, whose self possession, whose fervent energy in doing good will impress and awe the popular mind. For, without these moral traits, brilliant faculties and acquirements will be to the church little more than splendid vexations. And last—they must be men whose eye is single, whose hearts and purposes are governed by a profound and steady love of God. Such was Francis S. Sampson. Would that all the sons of our church might be such. She has had no more pure, more symmetrical, more elevated example, to which she may point her young ministers and members, and say, "Be ye followers of him, even as he also was of Christ."

.



## TRUE COURAGE.

---

A Discourse Commemorative of Lieut.-General Thomas J. Jackson.

---

Note: General Jackson died May 10th, 1863. In June following, the author was urgently requested to deliver a memorial sermon for him in Richmond. Having acceded to this request, he prepared the following discourse, and delivered it in the First Presbyterian Church, the evening of the first Sabbath of June, before a vast assemblage of officers, soldiers, and citizens. If the reader has happened to have seen also the *Life of General Jackson*, he will notice a certain similarity of thoughts, and even of language, in the sermon and in some parts of the narrative. The author has not been careful to suppress the whole of these in republishing the sermon, because he was not afraid of the charge of repeating his own matter, where it formed so appropriate, and indeed, so necessary a part of both compositions.

---

"Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more than they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell: yea, I say unto you, fear him."—Luke 12:4-5.

A little wisdom and experience will teach us to be very modest, in interpreting God's purposes by his providences. "It is the glory of the Lord to conceal a thing." His designs are too vast and complex for our puny minds to infer them, from the fragments of his ways which fall under our eyes. Yet, it is evident, that He intends us to learn instruction from the events which occur before us under the regulation of his holy will. The profane are more than once rebuked by him (as Is. 5: 12) because "they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands." And our Saviour sharply chides the Jewish Pharisees: "O ye hypocrites! ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the

times?" (Matt. 16: 3.) We are not therefore to refuse the lessons of those events which Providence evolves, because caution and humility are required in learning them. We have a guide, which will conduct us securely to the understanding of so much of them as God intends us to study: That guide is the Holy Scriptures. Among the several principles which they lay down for the explanation of God's dealings, it is sufficient for our present task, to declare this one: That the characters of his children, which exhibit the scriptural model, are given as examples, to be studied and imitated by us. He would thus teach us more than those abstract conceptions of Christian excellence, which are conveyed by general definitions of duty; he would give us a living picture and concrete idea. He thus aims to stimulate our aspirations and efforts, by showing us that the attainments of holiness are within human reach. He enstamps the moral likeness on the imitative soul by the warmth of admiration and love. That such is the use God intends us to make of noble examples, the Apostle James teaches us (5: 10)—"Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction and of patience"; and the Epistle to the Hebrews (6: 12) when it desires us to "be followers of them who, through faith and patience, inherit the promises."

Common sense teaches us then, from these texts, that the lesson is important and impressive, in proportion as the example given us was illustrious. By this rule, God addresses to us instruction of solemn emphasis, in the character, and the death, which we have now met to commemorate. Our dead hero is God's sermon to us, his embodied admonition, his incorporate discourse, to inculcate upon us the virtues with which he was adorned by the Holy Ghost; and especially those traits of the citizen, the Christian, and the soldier, now most essential to the times. He calls us, not to exhaust the occasion in useless sensibilities, but to come and learn the beauty of holiness, by the light of a shining example; and to let our passionate love and grief burn in upon the plastic heart, the impress of his principles. Happy shall I be, if I can so conceive and execute my humble task, as to permit this character to speak its own high lesson to your hearts. The only reason which makes you think this task appropriate to me, is doubtless this: that I had the

privilege of his friendship, and an opportunity for intimately observing his character, during the most brilliant part of his career. The expectations which you form from this fact, must be my justification from the charge of egotism, if I should allude to my own observations of him, in exemplifying these instructions. But I must also forewarn you, that should there be any expectation of mere anecdote to gratify an idle curiosity, or of any disclosures of confidential intercourse, now doubly sanctified by the seal of the tomb, it will not be gratified. And let it be added, that however the heart may prompt encomiums on the departed, these are not the direct object, but only the incidental result, of this discourse. I stand here, as God's herald, in God's sanctuary, on his holy day, by his authority. My business is, not to praise any man, however beloved and bewailed, but only to unfold God's message through his life and death. Among that circle of virtues which his symmetrical character displayed, since time would fail me to do justice to all, I propose more especially, to select one, for our consideration, his Christian courage.

Courage is the opposite of fear. But fear may be described either as a feeling and appreciation of existing danger, or an undue yielding to that feeling. It is in the latter sense, that it is unworthy. In the former, it is the necessary result of the natural desire for well-being, in a creature endued with reflection and forecast. Hence, a true courage implies the existence of fear, in the form of a sense, that is, of a feeling of danger. For courage is but the overcoming of that feeling by a worthier motive. A danger unfelt is as though it did not exist. No man could be called brave for advancing coolly upon a risk of which he was totally unconscious. It is only where there is an exertion of fortitude in bearing up against the consciousness of peril, that true courage has place. If there is any man who can literally say that "he knows no fear," then he deserves no credit for his composure. True, a generous fortitude, in resisting the consciousness of danger, will partly extinguish it; so that a sensibility to it, over-sensitive and prominent among the emotions, is an indication of a mean self-love.

There are three emotions which claim the name of courage. The first is animal courage. This is but the ferment of animal passions and blind sympathies, combined with an irrational

thoughtlessness. The man is courageous, only because he refuses to reflect; hold because he is blind. This animal hardihood, according to the obvious truths explained above, does not deserve the name of true courage; because there is no rational fortitude in resisting the consciousness of danger. And it is little worthy of trust; for having no foundation in a reasoning self command, a sudden, vivid perception of the evil hitherto unnoted, may, at any moment, supplant it with a panic, as unreasoning and intense as the previous fury. The second species of courage is that prompted by the spirit of personal honor. There is a consciousness of risk; but it is manfully controlled by the sentiment of pride, the keener fear of reproach, and the desire of applause. This kind of fortitude is more worthy of the name of courage, because it exhibits self-command. But after all, the motive is personal and selfish; and therefore the sentiment does not rise to the level of a virtue. The third species is the moral courage of him who fears God, and, for that reason, fears nothing else. There is an intelligent apprehension of danger; there is the natural instinct of self-love desiring to preserve its own well-being; but it is curbed and governed by the sense of duty, and desire for the approbation of God. This alone is true courage; true virtue; for it is rational, and its motive is moral and unselfish. It is a true Christian grace, when found in its purest forms, a grace whose highest exemplar, and whose source, is the Divine Redeemer; whose principle is that parent grace of the soul, *faith*. "David, and Samuel, and the prophets, *through faith* subdued kingdoms, \* \* \* waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." (Heb. 11: 33, 34.) Trust in God, in his faithfulness, his approbation, his reward, his command to have the risks allotted to them, was their motive. But "Christ dwelleth in our hearts by faith." (Eph. 3: 17.) This is the principle by which the soul of the believer is brought into living union with Christ; and the heart, otherwise sapless and withered, is penetrated by the vital sap of his holy Spirit. He is the head; men of faith his members; he the stock; they the branches; his divine principles circulate from him into their souls, and assimilate them to him. But the whole mission of Jesus Christ on earth is a divine exemplification of moral courage. What was it, save the unselfish sentiment of duty, overruling the anticipations of personal

evil, which made him declare, in prospect of all the woes of his incarnation, "Lo I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will Oh my God?" What else caused him to press forward with eager, hungering haste, through the toils and obloquy of his persecuted life, to that baptism of blood, which awaited him in Jerusalem? What else nerved him, when deserted, betrayed, and destined to death, desolate, and fainting, amidst a pitiless flood of enemies, one word of disclaimer might have rescued him, to refuse that word, and assert his rightful kingship over Zion, with a tenacity more indomitable than the grave? Jesus Christ is the divine pattern and fountain of heroism. Earth's true heroes are they who derive their courage from him.

Yet it is true, the three kinds of bravery which have been defined, may be mixed in many breasts. Some who have true moral courage may also have animal hardihood; and others of the truly brave may lack it. No Christian courage, perhaps, exists without a union of that which the spirit of personal honor, in its innocent phase, inspires; and many men of honor have perhaps some shade of the pure sentiment of duty, mingled with the pride and self-glorifying, which, chiefly nerve their fortitude. *But he is the bravest man who is the best Christian. It is he who truly fears God, who is entitled to fear nothing else.*

I. He whose conduct is governed by the fear of God, is brave, because the powers of his soul are in harmony. There is no mutiny or war within, of fear against shame, of duty against safety, of conscience and evil desire, by which the bad man has his heart unnerved. All the nobler capacities of the soul combine their strength, and especially, that master power, of which the wicked are compelled to sing: "It is conscience that makes cowards of us all," invigorates the soul with her plaudits. In conscious rectitude there is strength.

This strength General Jackson eminently possessed. He walked in the fear of God, with a perfect heart, keeping all his commandments and ordinances, blameless. Never has it been my happiness to know one of greater purity of life, or more regular and devout habits of prayer. As ever in his great task-master's eye, he seemed to devote every hour to the sentiment of duty, and only to live to fulfill his charge as a servant of God. Of this be assured, that all his eminence and success as

a great and brave soldier, were based on his eminence and sanctity as a Christian. Thus, every power of his soul was brought to move in sweet accord, under the guidance of an enlightened and honest conscience. How could such a soul fail to be courageous for the right?

But especially did he derive firmness and decision, from the peculiar strength of his conviction concerning the righteousness and necessity of this war. Had he not sought the light of the Holy Scriptures, in thorough examination and prayer, had his pure and honest conscience not justified the act, even in the eye of that Searcher of hearts, whose fear was his ever-present, ruling principle, never would he have drawn his sword in this great quarrel, at the prompting of any sectional pride, or ambition, or interest, or anger, or dread of obloquy. But having judged for himself, in all sincerity, he decided, with a force of conviction as fixed as the everlasting hills, that our enemies were the aggressors, that they assailed vital, essential rights, and that resistance unto death was our right and duty. On the correctness of that decision, reached through fervent prayer, under the teachings of the sure word of Scripture, through the light of the Holy Spirit, which he was assured God vouchsafed to him, he stood prepared to risk, not only earthly prospects and estate, but an immortal soul; and to venture, without one quiver of doubt or fear, before the irrevocable bar of God the Judge. The great question: "What if I die in this quarrel," was deliberately settled; so deliberately, so maturely, that he was ready to venture his everlasting all upon the belief that this was the path of duty.

II. The second reason which makes the man of faith brave, is stated in the context: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered: Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." God's special providence is over all his creatures, and all their actions; it is over them that fear him; for their good only. By that almighty and omniscient providence, all events are either produced; or at least permitted, limited, and overruled. There is no creature so great as to resist its power, none so minute as to evade its wisdom. Each particular act among the most multitudinous which confound our attention by their number,

or the most fortuitous, which entirely haffle our inquiry into their causes, is regulated by this intelligent purpose of God. Even when the thousand missiles of death, invisible to mortal sight, and sent forth aimless by those who launched them, shoot in inexplicable confusion over the battle-field, his eye gives each one an aim and a purpose, according to the plan of his wisdom. Thus teacheth our Saviour.

Now, the child of God is not taught what is the special will of God as to himself; he has no revelation as to the security of his person. Nor does he presume to predict what particular dispensation God will grant to the cause in which he is embarked. But he knows that, be it what it may, it will be wise, and right, and good. Whether the arrows of death shall smite him or pass him by, he knows no more than the unbelieving sinner; hut he knows that neither event can happen him without the purpose and will of his Heavenly Father. And that will, be it whichever it may, is guided by divine wisdom and love. Should the event prove a revelation of God's decision, and this was the place, and this the hour, for life to end; then he accepts it with calm submission; for are not the time and place chosen for him by the All-wise, who loves him from eternity? Him who walks in the true fear of God, God loves. He hath adopted him as his son forever, through his faith on the righteousness of the Redeemer. The divine anger is forever extinguished by the atonement of the Lamb of God, and the unchangeable love of God is conciliated to him by the spotless righteousness of his substitute. The preciousness of the unspeakable gift which God gave for his redemption, even the life of the Only-begotten, and the earnest of the Holy Ghost, bestowed upon him at first while a guilty sinner, are the arguments to this believer, of the richness and strength of God's love to him. He knows that a love so eternal, so free, so strong, in the breast of such a God and Saviour, can leave nothing unbestowed, which divine wisdom perceives to be for his true good. "He that spared not his own Son, hut delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things." (Rom. 8: 32.) And this love has enlisted for his safeguard, all the attributes of God, which are the security of his own blessedness. Why dwelleth the divine mind in ineffable, perpetual peace? Not because there are none to assail it; hut

because God is conscious in himself of infinite resources, for defense and victory; of a knowledge which no cunning can deceive; of a power which no combination can fatigue. Well, these same attributes, which support the stability of Jehovah's throne, surround the weakest child of God, with all the zeal of redeeming love. "The eternal God is his refuge; and underneath him are the everlasting arms." (Deut. 33: 27.) Therefore saith the Apostle, that the believer hath "his heart and mind garrisoned by the peace of God which passeth all understanding." (Phil. 4: 7.) And therefore our Saviour saith, with a literal emphasis of which our faint hearts are slow to take in the full glory: "Peace I leave with you; *my* peace I give unto you." (John 14: 27.) In proportion as God's children have faith to embrace the love of God to them, are they lifted in spirit to his very throne, and can look down upon the rage of battle, and the tumult of the people, with some of the holy disdain, the ineffable security, which constitute the blessedness of God. "Their life is hid with Christ in God."

It has been said that General Jackson was a fatalist, by those who knew not whereof they affirmed. He was a strong believer in the special providence of God. The doctrine of a Fate is, that all events are fixed by an immanent, physical necessity in the series of causes and effects themselves; a necessity as blind and unreasoning as the tendency of the stone towards the earth, when unsupported from beneath; a necessity as much controlling the intelligence and will of God as of creatures; a necessity which admits no modification of results through the agency of second causes, but renders them inoperative and non-essential, save as the mere, passive stepping stones in the inevitable progression. The doctrine of a Providence teaches that the regular, natural agency of second causes is sustained, preserved, and regulated by the power and intelligence of God; and that in and through that agency, every event is directed by his most wise and holy will, according to his plan, and the laws of nature which he has ordained. Fatalism tends to apathy, to absolute inaction: a belief in the providence of the Scriptures, to intelligent and hopeful effort. It does not overthrow, but rather establish the agency of second causes, because it teaches us that God's purpose to effectuate events only through them (save in the case of miracles) is as steadfast, as



his purpose to carry out his eternal plan. Hence it produces a combination of courageous serenity,—with cheerful diligence in the use of means. My illustrious leader was as laborious as he was trustful; and laborious precisely because he was trustful. Every thing that self-sacrificing care, and preparation, and forecast, and toil, could do, to prepare and to earn success, he did. And therefore it was, that God, without whom “the watchman waketh but in vain,” usually bestowed success. So likewise, his belief in the superintendence of the Almighty was a most strong and living conviction. In every order, or dispatch, announcing a victory, he was prompt to ascribe the result to the Lord of Hosts; and those simple, emphatic, devout ascriptions were with him no unmeaning formalities. In the very flush of triumph, he has been known to seize the juncture for the earnest inculcation of this truth upon the minds of his subordinates. On the momentous morning of Friday, June 27th, 1862, as the different corps of the patriot army were moving to their respective posts, to fill their parts in the mighty combination of their chief, after Jackson had held his final interview with him, and resumed his march for his position at Cold Harbour, his command was misled, by a misconception of his guides, and seemed about to mingle with, and confuse, another part of our forces. More than an hour of seemingly precious time was expended in rectifying this mistake; while the booming of cannon in the front told us that the struggle had begun, and made our breasts thrill with an agony of suspense, lest the irreparable hour should be lost by our delay; for we had still many miles to march. When this anxious fear was suggested privately to Jackson, he answered, with a calm and assured countenance: “No; let us trust that the providence of our God will so overrule it, that no mischief shall result.” And verily; no mischief did result. Providence brought us precisely into conjunction with the bodies with which we were to co-operate; the battle was joined at the right juncture and by the time the stars appeared, the right wing of the enemy, with which he was appointed to deal, was hurled in utter rout, across the river. More than once, when sent to bring one of his old fighting brigades into action, I had noticed him sitting motionless upon his horse with his right hand uplifted, while the war worn column poured in stern silence close by his side. At first it did not ap-

pear whether it was mere abstraction of thought, or a posture to relieve his fatigue. But at Port Republic, I saw it again; and watching him more narrowly, was convinced by his closed eyes and moving lips, that he was wrestling in silent prayer. I thought that I could surmise what was then passing through his fervent soul; the sovereignty of that Providence which worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, and giveth the battle not to the strong, nor the race to the swift: his own fearful responsibility, and need of that counsel and sound wisdom, which God alone can give; the crisis of his beloved country, and the balance trembling between defeat and victory; the precious lives of his veterans, which the inexorable necessities of war compelled him to jeopardize; the immortal souls passing to their account, perhaps unprepared; the widowhood and orphanage which might result from the orders he had just been compelled to issue. And as his beloved men swept by him to the front, into the storm of shot, doubtless his great heart, as tender as it was resolute, yearned over them in unutterable longings and intercessions, that "the Almighty would cover them with his feathers, and that his truth might be their shield and buckler." Surely the moral grandeur of this scene was akin to that, when Moses stood upon the Mount of God, and lifted up his hands, while Israel prevailed against Amalek! And what soldier would not desire to have the shield of such prayers, under which to fight? Were they not a more powerful element of success than the artillery, or the bayonets of the Stonewall Brigade?

III. The true fear of God ensures the safety of the immortal soul. United to Christ by faith, adopted into the unchanging favor of God, and heir of an inheritance in the skies which is as secure as the throne of God, the believing soul, is lifted above the reach of bodily dangers. But the soul is the true man, the true self, the part which alone feels or knows, desires or fears, sorrows or rejoices, and which lives forever. It is its fate which is irrevocable. If it be lost, all is lost; and finally lost; if it be secure, all other losses are secondary, yea, in comparison, trivial. To the child of God, the rage of enemies, mortal weapons, and pestilence are impotent. True, he has no assurance that they may not reach his body, but they reach his body only, and,

"If the plague come nigh,  
And sweep the wicked down to hell,  
T'will raise the saints on high."

This is our Saviour's argument, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body; and after that *have no more that they can do*" Pagan fable perhaps intended to foreshadow this glorious truth, when it described its hero with a body made invulnerable by its bath in the divine river, and therefore insensible to fear, and indifferent to the weapons of death. But the spiritual reality of the allegory is found only in the Christian, who has washed his soul from the stain of sin (which alone causes its death), in the Redeemer's blood. He is the invulnerable man. "The arrow cannot make him flee; darts are counted as stubble; he laugheth at the shaking of a spear." He shares, indeed the natural affections and instincts which make life sweet to every man, and bodily pain and death formidable. But these emotions of his sensuous being are counteracted by his faith, which gives to his soul a substantial, inward sense of heavenly life, as more real and satisfying than the carnal. The clearer the faith of the Christian, the more complete is this victory over natural fears. To the mere unbeliever, this mortal life is his all-in-all, bodily death is utter extinction, pain is the master evil, and the grave is covered by a horror of great darkness unrelieved by one ray of hope or light. And Christians of a weaker type, in their weaker moments, cannot shake off the shuddering of nature in the presence of these, the supreme evils of the natural man. But as faith brightens, that tremor is quieted; the more substantial the grasp of faith on eternal realities, the more does the giant death dwindle in his proportions, the less mortal does his sword appear, the narrower and more trivial seems the gap which he makes between this life and the higher; because that better life is brought nearer to the apprehension of the soul. Does the eagle lament to see the wolf ravage its deserted nest, as it betakes itself to its destined skies, and nerves its young pinions and fires its eyes in the beam of the king of day? The believer knows also, that should his body be smitten into the grave, the resurrection day will repair all the ravages of the sword, and restore the poor tenement to his occupancy, "fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body." He can adopt the boast of inspiration: "God is our refuge and strength;

a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea." (Ps. 46: 1, 2.) Amidst the storm of battle, and even the wreck of defeat, his steadfast heart knows no fear.

But that the enemy of God should have courage in battle, is incomprehensible to me. It can only be explained by thoughtlessness. When the danger which assails the body reaches the soul also, when the weapon that lays the body in the dust, will plunge the soul into everlasting and intolerable torments, by what philosophy can a reasoning being brace himself to meet it? He who has not God for his friend, has no right to be brave. But we should be far from inferring thence, that the citizen who is conscious of his enmity to God, is therefore justified in shunning the exposure to this risk, at the expense of duty and honor. This would be but to add sin to sin, and folly to folly. If safety is not found in the path of duty, still more surely it will not be found, when out of it. He is in the greatest danger, who is disobeying God; and infinite wisdom and power can never be at a loss for means to strike their enemy, however far removed wounds and weapons of war may be. To refuse a recognized duty is the surest way to alienate the mercy of God, and to grieve that Holy Ghost, on whom we depend for faith and repentance. The only safe or rational course therefore, for the ungodly soldier, is to make his peace with God at once; and thus advance with well-grounded confidence in the path of his duty, and of all men, the soldier has the strongest reasons to become a Christian!

Such was the foundation of the courage of Jackson. He walked with God, in conscious integrity; and he embraced with all his heart "the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ." His soul, I believe, dwelt habitually in the full assurance that God was his God, and his portion forever. His manly and vigorous faith brought heaven so near, that death had slight terrors for him. While it would be unjust to charge him with rashness in exposure to danger, yet whenever his sense of duty prompted it, he seemed to risk his person with an absolute indifference to fear. The sense of his responsibilities to his country, and the heat of his mighty spirit in the crisis of battle, might sometimes agitate him vehemently; but

never was the most imminent personal peril seen to disturb his equanimity for one moment. It is a striking trait of the impression which he has made upon his countrymen, that while no man could possibly be farther from boasting, it always became the first article of the belief of those subject to his command, that he was, of course, a man of perfect courage.

But courage alone does not explain the position which he held in the hearts of his people. In this land of heroic memories and brave men, others besides Jackson have displayed true courage. God did not endow him with several of those native gifts which are supposed to allure the idolatry of mankind towards their heroes. He affected no kingly mien nor martial pomp; but always bore himself with the modest propriety of the Christian. Nor did he ever study or practice those arts, by which a Bonaparte or an Alexander kindled the enthusiasm of their followers. The only manifestation which he ever made of himself was in the simple and diligent performance of the duties of his office. His part on the battle-field was usually rather suggestive of the zeal and industry of the faithful servant, than of the contagious exaltation of a master-spirit. Nature had not given to him even the corporeal gift of the trumpet tones, with which other leaders are said to have roused the divine phrensy in their followers. It was only at times that his modest and feeble voice was lifted up to his hosts; and then, as he shouted his favorite call: "Press forward," the fiery energy of his will, thrilled through his rapid utterance, rather like the deadly clang of the rifle, than the sonorous peal of the clarion. His was a master-spirit; but it was too simply grand to study dramatic sensations. It impressed its might upon the souls of his countrymen, not through deportment, but through deeds. Its discourses were toilsome marches and battles joined, its perorations were the thunder-claps of defeat hurled upon the enemies of his country. It revealed itself to us only through the purity and force of his action; and therefore the intensity of the effect he has produced.

This may help to explain the enigma of his reputation. How is it that this man, of all others least accustomed to exercise his own fancy, or address that of others, has stimulated the imagination, not only of his countrymen, but of the civilized world, above all the sons of genius among us? How has he.

the most unromantic of great men, become the hero of a living romance, the ideal of an inflamed fancy in every mind, even before his life had passed into history! How did that calm eye kindle the fire of so passionate a love and admiration in the heart of his people? He was brave, but not the only brave. He revealed transcendent military talent; but the diadem of his country now glows with a galaxy of such talent. He was successful; but we have more than one captain, whose banner never trailed before an enemy. I will tell you the solution. It was, chiefly, the singleness, purity, and elevation of his aims. Every one who observed him was as thoroughly convinced of his unselfish devotion to duty as of his courage; as certain that no thought of personal advancement, of ambition or applause, ever for one instant divided the homage of his heart with his great cause, and that "all the ends he aimed at were his country's, his God's, and truth's," as that he was brave. The love of his countrymen is the spontaneous testimony of the common conscience, to the beauty of holiness. It is the confession of our nature that the virtue of the Sacred Scriptures, which is a virtue purer and loftier than that of philosophy, is the true greatness, grander than knowledge, talent, courage, or success. Here, then, as I believe, is God's chief lesson in his life and death (and the belief encourages auspicious hopes concerning God's designs towards us.) He would teach us the beauty and power of pure Christianity, as an element of our social life, of our national career. Therefore he took an exemplar of Christian sincerity, as near perfection as the infirmities of our nature would permit, formed and trained in an honorable retirement; he set it in the furnace of trial, at an hour when great events and dangers had awakened the popular heart to most intense action; he illustrated it with that species of distinction which above all others, attracts the popular gaze, military glory; and held it up to the admiring inspection of a country grateful for the deliverances it had wrought for us. Thus he has taught us, how good a thing his fear is. He has made all men see and acknowledge that, in this man, his Christianity was the fountain head of the virtues and talents, which they so rapturously applauded; that it was the fear of God which made him so fearless of all else; that it was the love of God which animated his energies; that it was the singleness of his aims

which caused his whole body to be so full of light, that the unerring decisions of his judgment, suggested to the unthinking, the belief in his actual inspiration; and that the lofty chivalry of his nature was but the reflex of the Spirit of Christ. Do not even the profane admit this explanation of his character? Here then, is God's lesson, in this life, to these Confederate States: "It is righteousness that exalteth." Hear it ye young men, ye soldiers, ye magistrates, ye law-givers; that "he that exalteth himself shall be abased; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

But what would he teach us by his death, to our view so untimely? To this question, human reason can only answer, that God's judgments are far above us, and past our finding out.

One lovely Sabbath, riding alone with me to a religious service in a camp, General Jackson was talking of the general prospects of the war, hopefully, as he ever did. But at the close, he assumed an air of intense seriousness, and said: "I do not mean to convey the impression that I have not as much to live for as any man, and that life is not as sweet. But I do not desire to survive the independence of my country." Can this death be the answer to that wish? Can the solution be, that having tried us, and found us unworthy of such a deliverer, God has hid his favorite in the grave, in the brightness of his hopes, and before his blooming honors received any blight from disaster, from the calamities which our sins are about to bring upon us? Nay; we will not believe that the legacy of Jackson's prayers was all expended by us, when he died; they will yet avail for us all the more, that they are now sealed by his blood. The deliverance of the Jews did not end with the untimely end of Judas Maccabee. The death of William of Orange was not the death of the Dutch Republic. The lamented fall of John Hampden was not the fall of the liberties of England. And, if we may reverently associate another instance with these, the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, was, contrary to the fears of his disciples, but the beginning of the sect of the Nazarenes. So, let us hope, the tree of our liberties will flourish but the more for the precious blood by which it is watered.

May it not be, that God, after enabling him to render all the service which was essential to our deliverance, and showing us in him, the brightest example of the glory of Christianity,

has bid him enter into the joy of his Lord, at this juncture, in order to warn us against our incipient idolatry, and make us say: "It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in princes?" No man would more strongly deprecate this idolatry of human instruments, than Jackson, and never so strongly, as when addressed to himself. None can declare more emphatically than would he, if he spoke to us from the skies, that while man is mortal, the cause is immortal. Away then, with unmanly discouragements, God lives, though our hero is dead.

That he should have toiled so hard for the independence of his country, and so ardently desired it; and then at last, be forbidden to hail the day of our final deliverance, or to receive the grateful honors which his fellow-citizens were preparing for him; this has saddened every heart with a pang both tender and pungent. The medicine to this pain, my brethren, is to remember, that he has entered into a triumph and peace, so much more glorious than that which he bled to achieve for his country. It would have been sweet to us, to hail him returning from his last victory to a delivered and enfranchised country; sweet to see and sympathize with the joy with which he hung up his sword, and paid the sacrifices of thanksgiving in the courts of the Lord's house; sweet to witness, with reverent respect, the domestic bliss of the home for which he so much sighed, solacing him for his long fatigues. That happiness *we* have lost; but *he* has lost nothing. He has laid down his sword at the footstool of his Father God; he now sings his thanksgiving song in a nobler sanctuary than the earthly one he loved so much; he "bathes his weary soul in seas of heavenly rest."

We who loved him, while we bewail our own loss, should not forget the circumstances which alleviate the grief of his death. Surely, it was no ill-chosen time for God to call him to his rest, when his powers were in their undimmed prime, and his military glory at its zenith; when his greatest victory had just been won; and the last sounds of earth which reached him were the thanksgivings and blessings of a nation in raptures for his achievements; in tears for his sufferings. I love to remember, too, that his martyr-life had just been gladdened by the gratification of those affections which were in him so sweet and strong, and which yet, he sacrificed, so patiently, for his country.



Still more do we thank God that it was practicable, as it might not have been at an earlier, or a later period, for him to enjoy those ministrations of love, in his last days, which were the dearest solace of his sufferings. Into the sacredness of those last communings, and of the grief which survives them in his widowed home, we may not allow even our thoughts to intrude. And yet, may not a mourning nation venture to utter their blessing on the mourning heart which blessed him with its love; and to pray, that the breast which so magnanimously calmed its tumult, to make a quiet pillow for the dying head of their hero, may be visited by God, with the most healing balm of heavenly consolation? Will not all the people say: amen?

Nor will they forget the tender flower, sole off-shoot of the parent stock, born to bloom amidst the wintry storms of war, which he would fain have forbidden the summer breeze to visit too roughly. The giant tree which would have shielded it with pride so loving, lies prone before the blast. But His God will be its God; and as long as the most rugged breast of his hardy comrades is warm, it will not lack for a parent's tenderness.

And now, with one more lesson, I leave you to the teachings of the mighty dead. If there was one trait which was eminent in him above the rest, it was determination. This was the power, before whose steady and ardent heat obstacles melted away. This was the force, which caused his battalions to breast the onset of the enemy like ramparts of stone, or else launched them irresistibly upon their shivered lines. It was his unconquerable will, and purpose never to submit or yield. Every one who was near him imbibed something of this spirit, for they saw that in him the acceptance of defeat was an impossibility. To that conclusion no earthly power could bend his iron will. Let this example commend to us the same steadfast temper. In his fall and that of the noble army of martyrs, every generous soul should read a new argument for defending the cause for which he died, with invincible tenacity. Surely their very blood might cry out against us from the ground, if we permitted the soil, which drank the precious libation to be polluted with the despot's foot! Shall it ever be, that our discouragement or cowardice shall make the sacrifice vain? If we consent to this, then was it not treacherous in us to invite it?

We should rather have warned them to restrain their generosity, to save the lives they were so ready to lay upon their country's altar, as too precious to be wasted for a land occupied by predestined slaves and cowards, and to carry their patriotism and their gifts to some more propitious clime, and some worthier companionship.

Such are the thoughts which should inspire the heart of every one who stands beside the grave of Jackson. Around that green and swelling hill stands the circle of solemn mountain peaks keeping everlasting watch over the home which he loved and the tomb where his ashes sleep, majestic when the summer sunset bathes them in azure and gold, but only more grandly steadfast, when they are black with storms and winter. So, let us resolve, we will guard the honor and the rights for which he died, in the hour of triumph, and more immoveably in the hour of disaster.

## MEMORIAL OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOHN T. THORNTON, OF THE THIRD VIRGINIA CAVALRY, C. S. A.

---

Amidst the great company of Christian heroes whom Virginia has sacrificed for the independence of the Confederate States, few names, next to her Jackson's, shine more brightly than that of Lieut. Col. John T. Thornton, of Prince Edward, Va. The son of Mr. Wm. Thornton, of Cumberland county, he inherited from his father an honorable name, a vigorous understanding, and an ample estate. After the most careful literary training, he adopted the profession of law, and chose the town of Farmville for his residence. From the very beginning, his high honor and qualifications secured him the respect of his fellow-citizens; and he stepped into a busy practice, in which he was fast winning the highest grade of distinction. Here the present war found him, although still a young man, diligently engaged in his profession, the pride, the trusted counsellor, and chosen servant, of his county, and surrounded with all the domestic bliss which an elegant home, and an engaging family could confer. This happiness he was peculiarly fitted to enjoy. But although a liberal supporter, and habitual attendant, of the offices of religion, he was not yet a Christian: this crown was lacking to his character.

Mr. Thornton was in temper a conservative; and accordingly, in politics he was no extremist. Of the convention which dissolved the connection of Virginia with the Federal Union, he was chosen a member. There, and in the primary meetings of the people, his chaste and masculine eloquence was frequently heard, advocating, on the one hand, all the conciliation and forbearance towards our assailants consistent with honor and righteousness, and on the other, the most determined assertion of our essential rights. After witnessing the scornful rejection

of all the overtures our magnanimous Commonwealth made for the sake of peace, he heartily concurred in the act which made her independent of the betrayers of the Constitution; and when the convention adjourned, he immediately returned home, and accepted the command of a company of horse, composed of his friends and neighbors. This troop was embodied in the 3rd Virginia Cavalry. Although at first a novice in military affairs, he rapidly became a well-instructed and efficient officer, while his courage, fortitude, and impartiality, made him the idol of his men. As the first year of the war approached its end, all the volunteer regiments were reorganized; when he was chosen Lieutenant Colonel. Concerning this promotion he thus writes to his wife:

"In the reorganization of this regiment, I was chosen Lieutenant Colonel. This promotion was unexpected; but I shall accept it, and endeavor with all my powers to discharge its duties. I pray God to give me the requisite skill and courage for this position, that I may so bear myself in it, as to do good service to my country."

This place he filled with eminent success, and like a good soldier, "bore the heat and burden of the day." His former associates remarked with wonder, that he seemed formed by nature for a soldier; that although reared in elegance, and devoted hitherto almost exclusively to literary pursuits, he seemed to sleep anywhere, eat anything, and to endure any hardship, without inconvenience. He appeared thus, only because his manly spirit refused to complain of his trials; while in truth, both body and mind were suffering acutely under them. Throughout the bloody campaign of 1862, he was always at his post. In the expedition into Maryland, he was in command of the 3rd Regiment, then a part of General Fitzhugh Lee's Cavalry Brigade. In the combat of Boonsboro', when this brigade covered the retreat of the Confederate Army against the whole host of McClellan, the light of that clear autumn sun was turned into darkness by the smoke and battle dust. Down that famed causeway, as terrible as the jaws of hell, swept by cannon shot and shells, and by clouds of sharpshooters on the front, and right, and left, Colonel Thornton led his regiment again and again, in impetuous charges; until the purpose of the commander-in-chief was secured, in bringing off his artillery and trains.

In this fiery ordeal, though his horse was killed under him, he escaped unscathed. But on the bloody morning of Sharpsburg, as he was bringing his regiment into position to protect the left of the army, his punctilious obedience to orders led him to expose himself during a few minutes' halt, to a battery of the enemy; and almost the first shot which opened the fearful drama of the day, gave him a fatal wound. It exploded beside him, and one fragment tore his saddle to pieces, inflicting an irreparable shock on his body, while another crushed his arm almost from the hand to the shoulder. His frightened horse was arrested by his men, he sunk fainting into their arms, and was carried to a little farm house near the field. There, the surgeons endeavored to save his life by amputating his mangled limb; but in vain. After lingering for twelve hours insensible or delirious, he fell asleep.

His friends were aware that since he entered the service, his religious character had undergone a revolution. God, "whose thoughts are not as our thoughts," had employed the solemnities of this dreadful war, together with the death of two beloved brothers, to mature the convictions, which the sanctuary, and the pure Christian example that blessed his home, had implanted, but could not perfect. Numerous passages from his letters illustrate the birth and growth of his remarkable religious character.

Among the sad remains which were brought along with his corpse, to his widow, were a few of his prayers, written amidst the confusion of the bivouac, on bits of paper, and folded into his pocket-Bible. These precious relics of his piety I am permitted to copy; and the purpose of this introductory narrative is to present them to his personal friends, to his comrades in arms, and to the soldiers of our patriotic and suffering army, as his own solemn testimony to the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. In them, "he being dead, yet speaketh." The object is to permit him to speak chiefly for himself: no attempt is made to do more than place the necessary links of connection between the pieces which unfold his religious emotions. This brief portraiture cannot be made without a partial disclosure of those dearer affections, which Colonel Thornton's sensitive honor was wont to cover jealously in the sanctity of his own heart and home. But no brave man will be capable of reading

it with any other than emotions of reverent sympathy. Nor will any such fail to recognize, in the spirit which has yielded these sacred mementoes to the inspection of his brothers-in-arms, the same self-consecration, and preference of duty over feeling, which made him the Christian hero. It has only been done because of the belief, that, could the soul of the departed speak from that blest abode, where it is now, as we humbly trust, solaced for its pains, it would pronounce the commending of Christ to its fellows a dearer object than any earthly tie.

In the opinion of all who have been permitted to read them, these prayers are peculiarly excellent. They show a maturity of Christian feelings, a propriety in the selection of topics and language, a tenderness, fervency, and humility, remarkable in one who was so young in the faith. It is hoped that they will furnish to many a young disciple a pattern for his breathings after the Saviour, and to many a Christian husband and father in the army, a vehicle for transmitting to heaven his yearnings for "loved ones at home."

The reader's attention is especially called to the powerful awakening of the sense of parental responsibility in Colonel Thornton's bosom, as soon as he became a Christian. His most cherished desire for life, was, that he might return and aid his beloved wife in guiding the steps of his sons heavenward. It is noteworthy also, how frequently his servants are included in these Christian affections. He rarely forgets to send them his kindly salutations. He feels his obligations, as their master, to their souls, and prays for their temporal and eternal welfare. Colonel Thornton, a large slaveholder, the son of a large planter, reared near his father's servants, was the fairest type of that character, as developed under Southern institutions. The affectionate relations existing between him and his servants, and the bending of such a mind and heart to their good, are the clearest proofs of the wickedness of those who are shedding so much blood to destroy these ties. Another purpose of this little tract is, to show the world, in this specimen among a thousand of our Christian patriots, how high and holy are the principles which nerve their arms in this war. There is here, no lust of power, notoriety, or wealth; no unsanctified revenge: but the resolve of the virtuous soul, sadly, yet firmly accepting the mournful alternative of resistance, rather than recreancy

to duty. The enemies of our country, however they may condemn our material strength, may well tremble at the guilt of the wholesale murders they perpetrate to crush this righteous spirit of defense. It is the spirit of God's Word; it is sustained and prompted, in its noblest instances, by his Holy Ghost. Do they not see that, although God may chastise our ingratitude and irreligion towards him, by using their wicked hands as the instruments of correction, they are fighting against him, and their murders will yet be avenged in calamities so dire, that both the ears of them that hear shall tingle?

But it is time to proceed directly to the narrative of Colonel Thornton's religious life. His brief expressions of feeling must be weighed by the reader with this fact: that his character was always marked by a strong abhorrence of meaningless professions. He seems to have been, at the beginning of the war, not a stranger to prayer; but the death of two brothers in rapid succession, one of whom, a citizen of Texas, coming to Virginia with the soldiers of that State, only reached Richmond to die, profoundly deepened his religious emotions. October 18th, 1861, he writes from Camp Bethel, on the Peninsula:

"I feel sometimes very sad and solitary in this long absence from you. The death of S\*\*\*\* stunned by its suddenness and unexpectedness. I am left alone of all my brothers in this Confederacy. \* \* \* I would draw closer to your side than ever before.

"It is hard to bear my griefs alone; but I pray that I may see clearly in these bereavements, the hand of a wise and merciful God. I try to believe that 'He doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men'; that 'though he cause grief, yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of His tender mercies.' But my skepticism is sometimes painful, and it looks as though heaven were covered with a cloud through which my prayers could not pass."

The next extract which we make, may illustrate the habitual temper of his mind as to the issue of the war before him:

*"Six O'clock P. M.*

*"Camp in Lee's Field, April 9th, 1862.*

"We have now a large army in this Peninsula. Our men are in fine spirits, and I look with confidence to the God of battles, to give us the victory. I pray he may be my shield in the

hour of conflict. I have much to make life sweet to me. \* \* \* Let us implore humbly and earnestly the Father of mercies, who has showered so many blessings on us, that he will guide us through the perils of the dark hours of war, to the sunny, bright days of peace."

June 1st, 1862, he writes, making a definite avowal of his hope in Christ, and purpose to live a new life. After a tribute to the Christian fidelity of her to whom the letter is addressed, tender and glowing, he thus proceeds:

"This service in the army has not been without its benefits, and as I trust, great, lasting, and eternal benefits, to me. The busy, bustling life, that I had led ever since I left college, until I left home for the war, gave me but little time for calm, serious, sober thought on my past history and future life. In the quiet of the outpost, in the stillness of the camp at night, in the weary, solitary journeys to visit the chain of sentinels, I find ample time for reflection. With no books to read, with no business cares to engross or distract my attention, my mind has turned back upon myself, and often has the path I have trod been traveled over again by me. Thoughts of you \* \* \* restrained me from those vulgar vices of the camp, drinking and card-playing. Thoughts of you \* \* \*, kept back my tongue from profanity, and then thoughts of the words you had spoken and written to me \* \* \*, and thoughts of the goodness of God, and of my sins, and of my need as a sinner, led me to seek salvation through the mercy of God, and the atonement of Jesus. I trust \* \* \*, that I truly believe, and shall prove faithful to the end, and be an inheritor of the promises.

"If I am spared to return home, I trust that you and I \* \* \* will live through long years, to serve our Heavenly Father who has been so kind to us, if such be his holy will. But and honor and praise thee. Bless the children thou hast given to us. Aid us to train them up in thy knowledge and in thy fear, and to make them thy servants, pure, holy, and obedient.

"For my servants, Oh Lord God! I pray. Teach me how to act as their master, and instruct them how to discharge their duties as servants. Fill their hearts with love for thee; teach them to shun all evil, to live purely and uprightly, and finally save them with an eternal salvation.



"Into thy hands of love and mercy I trustingly commit myself, Oh Lord God Almighty. If it be in accordance with thy wise and great purposes, I beseech thee, bear me safely through all the perils of this war. Carry me back to my wife and home and children; and make me faithful to thee, walking in thy statutes, observing thy commandments, and honoring thee in all pureness and holiness of living. But if, Oh Lord! according to thy righteous decree, I am to fall by the hands of the enemy, or to die from any cause, then I implore thee, Heavenly Father, receive my soul, and take me to heaven to dwell forever in the light of thy holiness.

"If I have asked, Oh Lord, any thing wrong, I pray thee, forgive the evil thought, and blot out the wicked petition. If my prayers are pure and right, I beseech thee in the name of Jesus, and by reason of his death and sufferings, and because of his merits, to answer them. Add, I pray thee, Heavenly Father, every blessing on me and my household we are worthy to receive; and to thee let all honor and glory be ascribed. Amen."

The following letter displays his Christian trust as to the issues of the great struggle in which his country was engaged:

"Camp near Richmond, *June 20th*, 1862.

"It is now within four days of a year, since I left you and home to enter the army. It has been a year crowded with incidents of most momentous importance to our State and Confederacy; of events that will be read with interest for generations to come, by the student of history and the statesman. It will tell of a government erected by wise patriots, overthrown by mad ambition, sectional hate, and unreasoning fanaticism. It will tell of a powerful people summoned to arms to resist invasion and subjugation. The nations of the earth have looked with complacency upon the spectacle of a fierce and strong democracy, in a spirit of direst hate and meanest vengeance, striving in every way to crush and subjugate a feeble people who only ask to be let alone. This people, few in numbers compared with their adversaries, with an inadequate supply of arms and munitions of war, shut up from intercourse with any portion of the world, have kept them at bay for one year, and at the end of that time have forced them to call for a large increase of their military force. It is true, we during this time have sustained grievous reverses. In the future, we have sad

and severe trials before us. But God in his mercy has borne us up, and sustained us thus far, in our struggle for independence, and I have an abiding faith that he will crown us in the end with victory. I acknowledge with gratitude his mercy to me in this year of affliction. While so many have fallen around me, from disease and the enemy, he has graciously given me health and strength. He has mercifully protected you and our dear children, and our servants, during these twelve months of tribulations. Let us praise his holy name, and give thanks with grateful souls, for his loving kindness and mercy. He is a 'God of comfort' to us, as St. Paul calls him. I do sincerely pray that all this tender care of me may excite lively emotions of piety in my soul, and may constrain me to unite in your prayer that God will strengthen me and enable me to persevere in the new life I am striving to lead."

June 25th, he writes:

"It is useless to speculate as to the period when the war will end. I hear opinions of various shades expressed. It is still more idle to indulge in thoughts of what is to become of you and me in the progress of the conflict. Our lives and fortunes are in the hands of an all-wise and merciful God, and we must give our souls repose in the faith that he will do all things for us better than we could for ourselves. This is the truest, best, and firmest consolation we can have in these days of trouble. When I can visit home, it is impossible for me to say. How much I would like to drop in on you this morning, and see you with our children all around you. Let us trust such joy is laid up in store for us, and without perplexing our hearts, look forward to the future with confidence and courage. I doubt not, your faith is firmer than mine; but by mutual encouragement, we can strengthen the hearts of each other, to bear misfortune, if it is sent upon us, or to receive with joy and gratitude whatever blessings may be vouchsafed."

July 4th, 1862, he thus announces the results of the campaign before Richmond:

"The papers will give you an account of the triumphs vouchsafed to our arms by God, in the late battles around Richmond. He has mercifully protected me, but our loss in killed and wounded is fearfully large. Our whole land will be clothed in mourning. I pray God to console the bereaved hearts, and

to turn the charities of all our people upon those whose earthly protectors have been taken from them."

The reader will now be able to understand the allusion of the following

PRAYER.

*July 4th, 1862.*

My Father in Heaven, I come before thee this morning with a song of praise and thanksgiving for the victory thou hast given us over our enemies. Oh Lord, thou hast heard the prayers of thy people; their supplications and petitions have ascended to thy throne, and in the abundance of thy mercies thou hast heard them and answered them, by granting to our arms a triumph over our invaders. I feel and confess it is all from thee, Lord God Almighty; and to thy holy and glorious name do I ascribe all the praise. Continue, I pray thee, thy mercy and kindness to us as a nation. Give wisdom from on high to our rulers and generals, and all others in authority. Strengthen the hearts of our soldiers, shield their heads, and with thy strong arm bear up our banner in the conflict that is before us. Confuse and confound the counsels of our adversaries, drive them from our territory, and compel them by thy providence, to grant us a just and honorable peace. I pray thee, Oh Lord, to send thy Holy Spirit into the hearts of our soldiers, and make them soldiers of the Cross. Convert them to thy service, and make the people of the Confederate States a pious people, whose God is the Lord. I pray thee Oh Lord, to be with the sick and wounded of our army, in the hospitals and in the camps; alleviate their sufferings, soothe their pains, turn their hearts to thee, and bless them whether they live or die. I pray, Oh God, for a blessing on the regiment in which I serve. Make all connected with it godly men and brave soldiers. Grant them grace to serve thee, and give them courage for the discharge of every duty.

"I pray thee, Oh Lord, to forgive my sins, to wash away my iniquities, to renew my heart. Pour upon me thy grace, so that I may always do thy will. I pray, most merciful Father, that thou wilt make me pure, give me strength to put away all evil thoughts and impure desires, to resist all temptations and wicked suggestions. Make me to love thee supremely, and to prefer above all things else to do thy will, and to enjoy more

than any other employment, thy holy service. Enable me, Oh Father, to live near to thy Divine Son, my Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men. Be thou, Oh Son of God, if, in his wisdom and justice and mercy, he determines otherwise, and either of us be shortly taken from the other, then may the other bear the chastisement with meekness, and look forward to a reunion in God's own good time, on that blessed shore, where adieus and farewells are sounds unknown. \* \*

\* Kiss all the boys for me. Give my love to Mrs. —; I hope she has recovered. Remember me kindly to the servants. Farewell, \* \* \*. May God keep you and our dear children."

June 4th, 1862, he writes thus:

"Tell the dear boys I think often of them, and trust they will be obedient to you, and industrious in their studies. I have high hopes and expectations of our boys, and it would be a mercy of God for which we should pray, that you and I may be spared to see them reared to manhood, and to use our exertions to lead them to the paths of piety and honor."

The same hopes are pursued in his next:

"Camp near Richmond, *June 12th*, 1862.

"It is one of my earnest petitions to God, that if it be in accordance with his wise decrees, he may spare you and me, to train our dear boys under his guidance. I feel how weak and feeble I am in the Christian life. I trust, with fear and trembling, that my faith is sincere, and my hopes are well grounded. Certainly I could not object to your telling our friend L—, or any other friend you might desire to talk with on the subject, of my hope that my sins are pardoned, and that I am a true believer. But, I do not wish you to be deceived as to the state of my heart, and I know you would not deceive any one else. I have sinned much and long. I try, with a sincere penitence, I trust, to ask forgiveness of those sins from our Heavenly Father, by reason of the atonement made by our loving Saviour, whose righteousness I implore may be imputed to me. I feel the risings of sin in my heart every day. I endeavor to drive impure thoughts from my heart, to banish wicked words from my tongue, and to keep my hands from unclean deeds, but despite my striving, my prayers, my penitence, I sin. Conscious of my guilt, praying for forgiveness, I am a poor, weak Christian. You must not then expect to see high Christian graces in

me. I hope, I trust, I pray for increase of faith. I try to believe and implore God to help my unbelief. I notice all you say in reference to conversation with old and tried Christians. I should be rejoiced to have such friends to commune with, but I never could unveil my heart to any one except you; and even now, I do not know how I could speak to any one of my desire to be a Christian, of my communings with our Heavenly Father, of my faith in our adorable Saviour, of my prayers for the influence of the Holy Ghost. You must be my guide \* \* \* in the Christian walk \* \* \* and to you I must look for advice and counsel. I pray that the war may end, and you may take my hand in yours, and that we may pass along life's journey, aiding and encouraging each other in all our Christian duties."

About this time was written the first of these prayers which has been preserved; its date is June 10th. The bloody, but indecisive battle of Seven Pines had then been fought. The vast hosts of Federals were pressing close up to the beleaguered city. The army of Jackson was seemingly involved past hope in those complications of danger, from which it was soon to emerge in a blaze of glory. Every where, the condition of the Confederacy seemed to anxious patriots perilous, in the extreme. It was at this juncture Colonel Thornton penned these devout and solemn petitions:

#### A PRAYER.

"I beseech and implore thee, merciful Father, to look down with tender compassion on thy unworthy servant, to forgive his sins, to strengthen his faith, to fill his heart with thy grace, to shed upon his soul the influences of thy Holy Spirit; to give him bodily strength and courage for the discharge of all his duties, to illumine his mind with thy divine intelligence, to guide his feet in the path of holiness, to deliver him from every temptation that may assail him, to shield him from every assault of man or devil, to maintain him in health of body and purity of spirit, and finally to receive him in heaven, thy holy dwelling place; there to live forever in the joy and delight of thy presence.

"I pray thee, Oh God! to blot out my sins. I feel how vile and impure I am and have been. I feel that I can find refuge alone in the abundance of thy tender mercies: that nothing but

he blood of Jesus, our adorable Saviour can cleanse my vile heart of its pollution. Under the shadow of thy mercy I seek to hide: in the flood that flows from Calvary, I wash my soul.

"Preserve me, Oh Lord! from presumption, from a vain and foolish reliance on my own strength, from a silly confidence in the power and efficacy of my own good works; cause me at all times to know my folly and weakness; keep me continually mindful that salvation is all of free, unmerited grace; and never allow me for an instant to forget that the works of man, even the best he can perform, are marked by folly, and stained with guilt."

"In thy hands, Oh merciful Father, are the fortunes of my beloved State and Country. I recognize thy chastening hand in the afflictions thou hast sent upon our land and upon our people. Teach us all to submit with Christian humility to these sad tribulations, to bear with Christian resignation these severe trials, to bow beneath the rod, and with reverence to honor the hand that smites. In thine own appointed time, Oh God! thou wilt deliver us from the hands of our enemies and of those who hate us. Thou, Oh Lord! wilt, in thy good time, lead us by a path that thou wilt open to our feet, to safety and independence. Be thou, Oh Lord! our stay and our deliverance. In the day of battle be with us; uphold our hands, strengthen our hearts, and give us victory over our foes. Oh Lord! smite with thy righteous indignation the cruel invaders who now drive us from our homes and besiege our capital. Send thy angel, armed with the sword of justice, to execute vengeance upon our cruel foes. Make our army a holy instrument in thy hands, to punish the insolent tyrants who are now endeavoring to subjugate our people, to free our slaves, to confiscate our lands, and to take from us all that in thy goodness, thou hast given us. Drive the enemy, Oh Lord! from our soil. Give us, merciful Father, the blessings of peace. Shed the influences of thy Holy Spirit upon the hearts of our rulers and people, upon the hearts of the officers and privates of our army, and make us a God-fearing nation, whose ruler is the great Jehovah. I implore thee, Oh God! for thy blessing and especial favor on the regiment in which I am serving. Make them pure and holy. Make them a band of Christian warriors, who shall fight in thy strength. Cover their heads in the hour of conflict; crown them with vic-

tory over our Northern foes, and over the wiles and machinations of the Evil One.

"I beseech thee, Heavenly Father, to guard and guide, and console, and sustain, thy handmaiden and servant, the wife whom thou hast given me. Bless her, Oh Lord! at all times. Write thy law upon her heart. Shield her from all evil, and if it be thy holy will, unite her and myself once more, and permit us together, as heads of a Christian family, in peace to serve my elder Brother; thou hast atoned for my sins; hear my prayers for forgiveness and acceptance to our Father, and bring me back rich spiritual gifts. I pray thee, Oh God, to grant me health of body and steadiness of purpose, and cool, deliberate courage, and intelligence, to discharge all the duties of my position. Be with me in every trial: if thou wilt, shield me from every danger; if it be thy will that I fall in battle, receive my spirit, and take me to thy heavenly mansion, to dwell there forever in peace and rest, and joy and bliss, praising and serving thee.

"Oh merciful Father, I implore thy blessing upon my beloved wife. Comfort, console, and sustain her, I pray thee; fill her heart with thy grace; give her strength sufficient for all the severe labors she has to perform; grant her wisdom from on high to discharge every duty. Reunite her and myself, and let us through long years of peace, worship thee, and train our children and servants in thy service. I pray thee, Heavenly Father, to bless my children; and fill their tender hearts with love for thee; make them thy children; make them thine by election and adoption. Give their parents wisdom and grace, to train them for a heavenly inheritance. Bless my servants, I implore thee, most merciful God. Enable me to instruct them properly, and to govern them wisely. Make them thy servants, zealous in every good work; and finally receive them to thyself in heaven.

"I ask all these blessings in the name of my Saviour Jesus. I offer these petitions in the name of thy Holy Son. Hear me, and answer me, Oh God. Pour upon me every blessing thou in thy mercy and loving kindness, wilt grant. Amen."

## ANOTHER PRAYER.

*July 21st, 1862.*

"I approach thy throne, my Heavenly Father, this day, to acknowledge the benefits with which, in thy loving kindness and mercy, thou hast crowned me all the days of my life: to confess my sins, to implore forgiveness, to ask for thy grace and the influences of thy Holy Spirit; and to beseech thee to continue to regard me with favor, to load me with blessings, and to grant me courage of heart and strength of body to discharge rightly and properly all the duties of my position. Oh God, wash me clean in the blood of thy Son, Christ Jesus, my Saviour. Let me go to the cross, and live near to him who died that I may live. Raise me from the grave to sit beside him who first rose from the grave that he might show to men the way to heaven. In his name I offer my petitions; through his intercession I ask forgiveness; by reason of his sufferings and atonement, I expect salvation. I know that I am guilty, polluted, undone, and ruined; but I thank thee, Oh merciful Father, that on Calvary thou didst open a fountain, in whose stream the vilest and filthiest sinner may wash his guilt away. To that fountain filled with blood I would come, and cleanse my heart from every stain. Pity, forgive, and save me, Lord God Almighty. I pray thee, merciful Father, to shield me from all the perils that assail my life; from the pestilence that is abroad in the land, and from the cruel enemy that has invaded, and is now ravaging and destroying my State and Country. Be with me, Oh Lord God, at all times; shield me in the hour of conflict, and make my hand strong to strike for truth, and justice, and right. Save me, merciful Father, and restore me, when the war is over, and thou hast sent peace on our land, to my home, my wife, my children, and my servants.

"Bless, guide, comfort, and console the wife thou hast given me, and the children that have been born of our marriage. Reign and rule in their hearts. Make the mother skilful and apt to teach her children thy law, and turn the hearts of the children to do thy will. Reunite us, merciful Father, and uphold thy handmaiden and myself as the heads of a Christian family, and our offspring and servants as its members, teaching us all to love thy word and thy law, to live as becometh them who are striving for a heavenly inheritance, and finally



receive us all into heaven, thy holy dwelling place, to praise and honor and serve thee through all eternity.

"Oh Lord God! have mercy on my country, these Confederate States, now struggling for salvation from tyranny and oppression, and seeking the rights thou hast given us as a nation, through an agony of blood and suffering. I see, Oh God, the desolations that mark the footsteps of our cruel enemy. Before me are the naked fields, the ruins of the burned dwelling, and far away from the fierce foe are the houseless and homeless wanderers. These cruel tyrants boast of their large numbers, their great wealth, and their power, vastly superior to that of these poor States. They rely on the arm of flesh. We trust in thee, Oh Lord God Jehovah! Be thou our fortress and our defense; God of battles, be with the soldiers of this Confederacy, and give them victory; God of truth and justice, reign in the hearts of the people all over the land; God of wisdom, illumine the minds of our rulers and officers; God of mercy, give us peace; God of nations, give us independence; and to thy name be all honor and glory, forever and ever. Amen."

July 22nd, 1862, he wrote from the region of the Pamunkey, a letter well describing the principles which made him resolute in enduring, without any ambitious aspirations, a separation so irksome to his soul.

"I am amused at the delight you so heartily manifest, at my not meeting the enemy, who were reported as crossing into King William. You say you cannot wish me any opportunity of distinction where my life will be placed in jeopardy. In reply I would say, that I only desire to do my duty. I have no thirst for military fame; for I know it is won through blood and tears and suffering. But I do desire to aid in driving the base invader from Virginia's soil. I am amazed that men can sit quietly at home, when they see the fate that awaits us if the enemy succeeds in subjugating us. I am sitting now, as I write, in full view of what was, before the invasion, one of the loveliest estates in Virginia. It is now a scene of desolation; the fields are naked, the fences destroyed, the houses burned, the laborers stolen away, and the owners fugitives, and, if this were all their wealth, beggars."

His remaining letters, written on the march from lower Virginia to Manassas and Maryland, were little more than

brief notes, penned in moments snatched from the fatigues of the journey. But in all of them, his yearnings for the society of his beloved home were mingled with prayers for faith and strength to bear his lot with fortitude. The last specimen of prayer which he left is incomplete. Perhaps the bugle-call summoned him away from the solemn and pleasing communion of the mercy seat, to the march or the combat.

THE LAST PRAYER.

*July 27th, 1862.*

"I come before thee, Oh Lord God Almighty, on this thy holy day, to thank thee for the many mercies I have received from thy loving hand, and for the protection thou hast heretofore afforded me; to ask that thou wilt not withdraw thy mercy, favor, and protection from me, but wilt continue to crown me with blessings, and shield me from all assaults of the world, the flesh, and the Devil. I come to implore the forgiveness of my sins, pardon for all my guilt, and eternal salvation for my soul, through the merits and intercession of thine adorable Son Christ Jesus. I come to praise thee for the loving kindness and tender compassion which, at such a cost, and at such a sacrifice, furnished a way of escape for guilty man. Oh Lord! I would live near to thy Son Christ Jesus, our Lord and Saviour. I pray thee to give me grace, to illumine my understanding, to fill my heart with love, to make thy service my delightful work, and obedience to thy law my most pleasant duty. Save me, I beseech thee, from vain-glorying, from boasting, from self-reliance, ——"

Thus the expression of his longings for holiness were broken off unfinished, like his life. But his friends may trust that his life, so full of promise here was but the infancy of a far more blessed and glorious existence in that heaven to which he aspired; and so, that these acts of worship, interrupted here below are now continued with a nobler, sweeter tongue, and with higher raptures, where there are no wars nor rumors of wars to disturb the saints, in the heavenly Sabbath.

These mementoes exhibit, so far as a brief Christian life of less than a year could, the renewing power of the religion of Jesus Christ, in a high degree. The scriptural tone of the petitions shows, in one so young in divine knowledge, the evident teachings of the Holy Ghost. The change in Colonel

Thornton's character was marked. He was, by nature, a proud spirit; we here find his prayers breathing the most profound humility. His character was usually apprehended to be stern; these exercises of soul are instinct with a melting tenderness, for all, except the enemies of righteousness. This attempt to display his inner life is now closed, with the earnest prayer, that God may incline the hearts of all his friends and comrades, and of every brave soldier of our country, to seek his Saviour, to imitate his example so far as he was a follower of Jesus Christ, and to raise to the throne of grace, these, or such-like prayers.

## NATURE CANNOT REVOLUTIONIZE NATURE.<sup>1</sup>

---

"And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

There are some things which can be done, and there are some others which obviously cannot. The curious thing about this very trite fact is, that people continue trying to do these other things, as though they were feasible. This they do both in the mechanical and moral world. Thus: there are some people always, who are inventing perpetual motion, and just on the point of effecting it. Many and diverse, says the *Scientific American*, are the machines invented for this purpose; but it recommends to all future experimenters, as the cheapest and simplest, and equally effective with the best, the plain *tub*. The machine of the tub is operated thus. The vessel chosen is a large one, with handles. It is placed on the floor; the operator then gets into it, and laying hold of the handles with his hands, lifts the tub up to the ceiling. Succeeding in this, he has perpetual motion in its simplest principle.

In every generation, the social, political, and religious tub-lifters are numerous. "Mother Anna Lee," patron saint of the Shakers, was going to abolish sin by abolishing matrimony. The plan was simple, and perfectly effectual. Convert all the adult sinners, and agree that when converted they shall have no more children. As all actual transgression comes out of original sin, and all original sin is transmitted by birth, one generation more would happily finish the work of Satan on earth. The good mother only made one little mistake in the project. Who were to carry out this excellent plan? The men and women, of course. But men and women usually have a natural propensity, which is more fundamental and regulative than the desire to arrest original sin. So it turns out that poor human nature doesn't lift itself in Mother Lee's tub; but goes on multiplying and increasing, and replenishing the earth with

---

1—From the *New York Independent*.

young sinners; leaving the world's redemption to the less symmetrical plan of the Gospel.

So Mr. John Stuart Mill proved to his own satisfaction that all individual title to real estate is adverse to the public weal; and the "International" communists, going a little farther, declare, *La propriété c'est le crime!* "Establish community of goods; and public spirit will make the best of everything, and procure the greatest good to the greatest number." Here again, man is to lift himself in his tub. It is forgotten that nature has made the desire for the special welfare of one's self, and of one's own family, far stronger than the desire for the general good. Hence the only possible result of the theory is, not that private property shall be happily substituted by communism; but that happy civilized societies may be plunged into anarchy; and what little private property is left be held with a far fiercer grasp, and defended by personal violence instead of by regulated and benignant law. Natural selfishness will never lift itself into disinterestedness, least of all by force of an infidel creed which makes selfish pleasure its *summum bonum*.

Another instance of the tub-movement is seen in Mrs. Cady Stanton's "Women's Rights." Woman is to be freed from her subordination to man! By whom, forsooth? Not by the selfish, masculine despot, of course; for every impulse of his selfishness prompts him to perpetuate the tyranny. It is to be done, then, by woman. She is to make herself independent of man! But the Creator, who made men and women, has laid down the law, "Unto him shall be thy desire," as the foundation of woman's nature. So that the amount of the claim for women's rights is, again, that the inventor shall lift herself in her tub. Were the realizing of the revolution the only danger, men might safely give Mrs. Cady Stanton their full leave to succeed. She would then find that her real difficulty was unsurmounted; that every one of her "oppressed" sisters, who was a true woman, would voluntarily desert her and seek to be beloved, cherished, and protected by one of the masculine "tyrants"; and this by the inevitable force of a nature a thousandfold more imperative than her zeal for Mrs. Cady Stanton's revolution. And hence again, the only possible result of this movement will be, not the independence and equality of woman, but the substitution of the savage dependence of the

slave-concubine, the "weaker vessel" held and abused by brute force, for the benignant order of scriptural marriage.

These attempts to do the impossible illustrate the most absurd enterprise of all: the attempt of our modern materialistic infidels to abolish religion. The Commune shouted, "Down with property and religion, the two chief enemies of human progress." The only result of success in destroying religion would be to replace it with some mischievous superstition. This is sufficiently evinced, to any sober mind, by a review of the past. Every people, in every age, has had either its religion or its superstition; either its God or its Fetich. Now, a universal result is an index of a permanent cause: there must be something in human nature which compels it to recognize the supernatural. When our would-be philosophers assume that they can exist without this necessity, it is only the very modest pretension that they are themselves supernatural; that is, more than men. That religion is inevitable to man may be inferred again from the uniform result of every attempt which has been made to exclude, or even to omit it from human thought and life. They have always been predestined failures. Thus, those who profess to understand the system of Confucius, nominally so dominant in China, tell us that it is not really a religion, but a social system of morals; that it offers the Chinese mind no object of divine homage save an abstraction; and that it is in fact only a system of moral rules enforcing the idea of civic subordination; the only worship inculcated, that of dead ancestors, being designed merely to strengthen the impulse of filial respect. What now, is the result? There is no people who make a more frequent recognition of the supernatural. To say nothing of the vast system of Buddhism, the whole nation seems enslaved to demon worship, and to the bondage of "the evil eye," "the influence," and the genii of localities. Yet the Chinese are at once the most astute and the most materialistic of the Oriental races.

But we may come nearer home. The materialist Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, was said to be more afraid of ghosts than any educated man in England. Atheistic French Democracy professed to abrogate God, the Church, and the Sabbath; but so strong was the religious necessity, that even these madmen enthroned the "Goddess of Reason." Auguste Comte spent

his life in teaching that his "Positive Philosophy" necessarily excluded every supernatural notion. But at its close he finished by establishing a new religion, and a proposed hierarchy with Comte as its hierophant, and the soul of his deceased mistress as a sort of "Queen of Heaven."

These facts may be set in a light still more mortifying to the enemies of Christianity, and more conclusive against their hopes. The weakest religions have always been strong enough to outvie infidelity upon a fair trial. What has it then to hope, in the presence of a true Christianity, with its purity and power? Even popery, the fruitful mother of infidels, has Saturnian strength enough to devour these, her own children. French popery begot Voltaire; and so sorry a religion as French popery was adequate to overthrow Voltaireism. We are told that the effect of national misfortune and humiliation has been to fill the Romish Church again with Frenchmen (and not women only), and to precipitate the people into sham miracles, the pilgrimages, and the other fooleries of the Middle Ages. The Augustan age of classic paganism gave a similar result. Greek and Roman philosophy deemed itself too wise to retain the old traditionary creed of their fathers. They could laugh at the *auspices*, and explode Pan and Ceres, Castor and Pollux, with the herd of imaginary gods. But none the less must the Augustan age have gods from some whither; so philosophic Athens had its altar to "The Unknown God," and imperial Rome imported Judaism, the mystery of the Egyptian Iris, and the magic of the East. Now, gentlemen infidels, we may heartily concur with you in your scurvy estimate of these ancient and modern paganisms, the religions of Jupiter and the Pope. But we remind you, that scurvy as they were, they were sufficient to conquer you. "If these things were done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" If mankind is compelled by the constitution of the soul, in ages when it seemed to have no better choice than between these wretched creeds and you, to prefer either of these to you; what are your prospects against the universal diffusion of the Christian religion, with its ennobling and satisfying truths?

The rational account of these results is in the law with which we set out. Nature cannot revolutionize nature. The human soul has certain original, constitutive, universal laws

of thinking and feeling, the presence of which qualify it as a rational human soul. Hence, whatever any soul thinks or feels is a result of these regulative laws. It is, then, infallibly certain that these cannot be abrogated or expunged by their own results, for the same reason that streams cannot change their own fountains, and children cannot determine the being of their own parents. Let men, for instance, throw any light of plausibility they may around materialism; let them please themselves with the fancy that they have identified mind with matter; let the physiologist pretend to trace the power of thought into his "nerve-force," and to resolve this in turn into electricity. There remains still the stubborn and fundamental fact of psychology, which the common sense of men will, in the end, always construe for themselves, without or against the pretended helps of science; that the consciousness of that which thinks, the subjective Ego, is necessarily prior to all possible perception of objective matter. So that the only terms upon which man can know matter at all involve *a priori* the recognition of mind as inevitably contrasted with matter. That is, the very law of our cognition is, that we must first know mind as not matter in order to know matter.

Our most recent infidelity asserts that nothing is valid except that which is formed on the perceptions of the senses. But unless they accept with us the supersensuous rational belief, that what sense gives us is valid, it is impossible for sense itself to show them any truth.

•Again, man must cease to be man before he can strip himself of conscience, of the conviction of moral responsibility, of the sense of guilt for transgression, of hope, of fear, and of the inextinguishable desire for his own well-being. These sentiments are the universal results of fundamental intuitions. All that can be done is to forget them or to obscure them for a time; but when they are revived by the touch of affliction, danger, remorse, or death, man will derive and seek a propitiation for his guilt, a preparation for judgment, and a way to future happiness, as surely as he is man. The sentiment of religion is omnipotent in the end. We might rest in assurance of its triumph, even without appealing to the work of that Holy Ghost which Christianity promises as the omnipotent coadjutor of the truth. While irreligious men of science explore the facts of



natural history, and the fossils of earthly strata, for fancied proofs of a creation by evolution which may dispense with a Creator, the humble heralds of our Lord Christ will continue to lay their hands upon the heart-strings of living immortal men, and find there always forces to overwhelm unbelief with defeat. Does the "Positivist" say these propositions are only of things spiritual? Ay, but spiritual consciousnesses are more stable than all his primitive granite! Centuries hence, if man shall continue in his present state so long, when the current theories of unbelief shall have been consigned to that limbus where polytheism and the Ptolemaic astronomy, alchemy, and judicial astrology lie contemned, the servants of the Cross will be winning larger and yet larger victories for Christ, with the same Gospel which was preached by Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, Paul, Augustine and Calvin.

Hampden Sidney, Va., Oct. 1st, 1873.

## SAMUEL C. ANDERSON, OF PRINCE EDWARD.<sup>1</sup>

---

Every Presbyterian of intelligence, who visited the neighborhood of Hampden Sidney about the years 1835 to 1840, carried away with him, among his most pleasing recollections, the memories of the hospitable mansion of Mr. Anderson. He was then in the prime of his corporeal and intellectual powers, and of his Christian influence; a leading elder in the College Church, and trustee of the College, the foremost advocate at the bar of his county; and the honored and trusted adviser of its people. His house during all these years, was frequented with delight by young and old, and was the center of a wide circle of cultivated, Christian society; where Mr. Anderson, assisted by his accomplished wife, and his lovely adopted daughter, dispensed a professional income almost princely, in unbounded hospitalities and charities. His noble person and countenance will not speedily be forgotten by any, who saw him in the animation of social converse, or in the flow of his masculine and impetuous oratory. He was, in every sense, a man of nature's noblest mould.

Amidst the horrors and confusions attending the closing campaign of General Lee upon the Appomattox, the death of this venerable servant of God has perhaps passed unnoted by many of his former friends. The suspension of the circulation of the religious journals has also delayed the publication of the usual tribute to his memory. This will now be attempted, in the form of a brief narrative.

Mr. Anderson was the son of a respectable planter upon Willis' River, in the county of Cumberland, where he was born July 21st, 1788. Up to approaching manhood, he received only the plain education of the old-field-school: when he was seized with an irresistible desire for a liberal education. There was an excellent classical school six or seven miles distant; but his father declared that, while he might be able to pay his tuition,

---

1—Appeared in *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, April, 1864.

his limited circumstances forbade his assuming the expense of his boarding abroad. The youth declared that he would frequent the school daily from home, notwithstanding the distance. His father supposed that he would soon weary of this undertaking, but gave his consent to the experiment. He joyfully accepted the opportunity; and for several years was the most punctual pupil at the school. Taking his breakfast with the dawn, he might be seen every morning before the sun, setting out afoot upon his daily journey, and he was usually the first scholar at the school-house. Here he gained a solid training in the classics, and some of the rudiments of science; and this was the only patrimony he ever received from his father.

While still a youth, he went to the county of Powhatan, where for four years he taught a country school. In this avocation his success was so great, that old Dr. Lacy (Silver-fist), himself a famous teacher, declared he ought to be compelled to follow it for life, for the public good. His talent of command and force of character were here strongly developed. His diligence and punctuality were unfailing, and such was the industry and subordination he inspired, that a lazy or bad boy was unknown in his school. After the good, old Virginian fashion, the boys and girls of the neighborhood were taught together: a custom which did much to foster that courtesy, mutual respect, and purity, which so highly distinguished the intercourse of the sexes among us. In these schools, under the eye of a watchful teacher, the young learned from childhood the proper "metes and bounds" of virtuous intercourse, and grew up from little gentlemen and ladies. Mr. Anderson was peculiarly watchful in guarding this intercourse, and exacting of the boys a punctilious respect for their female associates. He said that the greatest whipping he ever gave, was to a gawky youth (as big as himself) for entering the school-room on a sultry afternoon, without his coat (clothed in the other garments, shirt, vest, trousers, etc.)

Having served two campaigns with credit in the State forces, during the war of 1812, he returned to civil life, and studied the science of law with Captain Henry E. Watkins, of Prince Edward, his life-long friend, and co-elder. He commenced the practice of this profession in the year 1816, at Prince Edward Court House. Here he married, settled, and

spent his life. His diligence, integrity, and forensic eloquence speedily raised him to the head of his profession: a post which he did not fail to maintain, to the end of his active life. As a lawyer, he was quick, ready, full of resource in debate, impatient of the labor of preliminary research, but overpowering in rejoinder. His generous sympathies and ardent nature caused him to identify himself warmly with his clients: so that he was always a zealous advocate. His comrades, knowing the influence of forensic strife in rousing his powers, and the force of his oratory upon juries, always sought to give him the closing speech in important cases. The best judges have said that, in those years, Samuel C. Anderson, in the bar of Prince Edward or Buckingham, exposing some artful fraud, or pleading the aspersed honor of innocent woman, was the noblest specimen of manly beauty, power, and eloquence, ever seen in that region.

Upon the retirement of John Randolph, of Roanoke, from Congress, the leading citizens of his party urged Mr. Anderson to become a candidate for that place, with the certainty of being elected his successor. He declined the proposal, in favor of Judge Bouldin; who served for a short time with great distinction, and died in his seat in the House, of apoplexy. The reason assigned by Mr. Anderson for refusing political honors at that time, was worthy of the consideration of every young man. He said that he had a liberal professional income, with free and hospitable habits of living, without private estate. Hence, as his attention to public affairs must diminish his earnings, he could not at once maintain his domestic establishment, and his pecuniary independence. But no man, he judged, should be entrusted with the interests of his country, whose personal independence was encumbered with any financial shackles: lest they should become a temptation to tarnish that bright purity of action, which the public servant should ever possess.

In the year 1828 the visit of Dr. Nettleton to Virginia occurred, which resulted in so remarkable and permanent a work of grace. On the invitation of Dr. John H. Rice, this eloquent and holy man visited the region about the College; and his labors were instrumental in bringing into the church a large number of the first men of the country, of whom many have

fallen asleep; but some yet remain to adorn their profession. Among these converts was Mr. Anderson. He had lived hitherto, strictly honorable and virtuous after the world's standard, but "without God in the world," and in the very luxuriance of his health, prosperity, and manly energies. The word of God now took hold upon him with giant power. He declared that although, in one sense, he had heard many able preachers, whose sermons his retentive memory would have enabled him to repeat almost entire, in another sense, he had never heard a sermon before. The nature of God's law, his relations to it, and his wants as a sinner, were now seen by him in as new a light, as though he had been hitherto one of Paul's Athenian hearers upon Areopagus. With an overpowering conviction of his guilt and misery fixed in his soul, he determined that he would at once seek its salvation with all his might. Dr. Nettleton was holding private meetings for special instruction, in the parlor of Dr. Rice (in the northeastern corner of the Seminary building, then just partly erected) similar to what are now called inquiry-meetings: and all those who desired more particular knowledge of 'what they must do to be saved,' were invited to attend there in the evening. Many powerful impulses of pride and false shame deterred Mr. Anderson from attending. The evil principles within him pleaded: "What will your gay, professional comrades say, when they hear that the lofty head of Samuel C. Anderson is bowed in such a meeting, amidst a cluster of weeping school-boys and girls, confessing his sins to a parson?" As he rode to the place, his breast was in a tumult of strife; and when he came to the door of the room, saw the lights within, and the solemn stillness of the company, so powerful was the struggle between the evil and the good within him, that, he declared, it was as though some invisible, but adamantine bar had been placed across the door of the room, which resisted his entrance with a palpable force. But he bethought himself that this reluctance to enter was prompted by sinful affections, seconded most probably by Satan: that he needed the instruction he sought there; and that if he now yielded to a false impulse, and retired, it would be a virtual turning of his back upon Christ and duty, for the sake of sin, and might be the sealing of his impenitence forever. He therefore nerved himself with an almost desperate resolve, and literally broke

through into the room, where he took his seat among the penitents. This decisive moment seemed to be the turning point with his soul, and he speedily found peace in believing. The determination to cast all sinful and Satanic obstacles behind him, in pursuing those means of grace which he felt to be appropriate to his wants and duty, was probably nothing else than the initial acting of faith and repentance, in embracing Christ, and his service: although at first he knew it not as such. He soon enrolled himself among God's people; and such was his Christian walk, that after a few years, he was elected one of their elders: an office which he filled with increasing piety to his death.

His abilities and decision speedily made him a man of mark in the Presbyterian Church. He cultivated an ardent friendship for her leading ministers, and especially for Drs. Rice and Baxter, whose steady coadjutor and adviser he was, in all their labors for Zion. With his usual liberality, he now set apart one-third of his income, the whole of which proceeded from his professional labor, for the service of the church; and during his prosperous years, this portion was expended in charities, in sustaining the religious press, and in other Christian enterprises, besides the sums lavished in his unfailing hospitalities.

The most signal service which he rendered to the church, in the estimation of the public at large, was his famous speech in the Assembly of 1837, in support of the, so-called, excinding acts. Dr. Baxter and he were among the commissioners from West Hanover Presbytery to that body: in which the former was the acknowledged leader of the old school. It was in Baxter's capacious mind that the plan originated, after all other expedients seemed hopeless, of ridding the church of the incubus of the new measures and theology, by declaring the Plan of Union unconstitutional. During the sessions of the Assembly he came to Mr. Anderson and asked him briefly: "If a legislative proceeding be found unconstitutional, what becomes of the executive and administrative acts which are grounded on it?" "They are all," said Mr. Anderson, "null and void, in law." "Then," said Dr. Baxter, "prepare yourself to prove it in the Assembly." The doctor, having explained his views to the old-school men, in their nightly convention, or caucus,

moved them the next day, in the house, in a short series of propositions, whose logic was built together like an arch of stone; and then remitted the discussion mainly to younger and more forward men. The chief debaters of the two parties now waged, for several days, a forensic war of the giants. The New School relied upon an elder from Pennsylvania, who was also a distinguished judge at law, to assail the legal principles of Dr. Baxter's plan. Mr. Anderson went to him, and politely indicated his wish to take part in the discussion on the other side, requesting the use of the legal authorities introduced into the case. This the judge politely accorded; and it may be added that, in the subsequent discussion, the two maintained towards each other a forensic courtesy, by which the acrimony of many of the clergy was put to shame. The judge also suggested that Mr. Anderson, if he could succeed in getting the floor in the general eagerness to speak, at the end of his speech, should make the closing reply. The latter could not but indulge an inward smile, as he said to himself: "Had you known the estimate of my peculiar forte held by my legal brethren at home, you would hardly have volunteered this proposal." The judge, with the customary self-esteem of his section, evidently regarded his proposed antagonist from the South, as the reverse of formidable.

Meantime, the clerical leaders of the Old School, had laid out their parliamentary tactics for the day, designing to put up one of their leading debaters to reply to the legal argument of the judge, and selecting an active man, at the close of that speech, to spring to his feet, secure the floor, and demand the previous question. But when the judge finished, to their great chagrin, Mr. Anderson obtained the floor, instead of their champion. Their faces showed mortification; those of the larger number displayed wonder, who this unknown combatant could be who thus thrust himself into the war of the princes; and Dr. Baxter, who knew his man, was suffused with a smile of quiet enjoyment. When Mr. Anderson found that the Moderator had recognized him, all his self-possession for a moment deserted him: He, who was perfectly collected in the stormier forums of the bar and hustings, now found himself without a single idea, in this novel arena, before the vast audience collected from every part of the Union, and especially at the

thought of the anxious and sympathizing countenance of his beloved wife, which he well knew, was bent upon him from some retired nook of the galleries. But he said that he be-thought himself to fill up a minute with some commonplaces about his respect for the Moderator and the body, and his diffidence, until his self-possession returned to him: and after this exordium, he was conscious that he had regained the full poise of all his faculties. As he proceeded in his rejoinder, the impatience of the house was replaced by surprise, and by delight. Whispers of, "Who is he?" "Who is he?" ran over the audience. He proceeded, with just such vigorous and courteous logic as he was accustomed to employ in the courts of Virginia, intermingled with happy repartee and luxuriant humor, to turn the legal argument of the New School inside out, to overthrow their positions with their own authorities, and to sweep away their arguments, like the wind the chaff of the threshing floor. It was manifest that he was making a profound impression on the house, and that his argument must be decisive of the vote. Dr. Absalom Peters, the Ajax of the New School, writhing like a culprit upon the rack, at the demolition of his cause, could contain himself no longer; but springing to his feet interrupted Mr. Anderson, and announcing again a position which he seemed to regard as the very citadel of his strength, said tauntingly, "I should like to hear the gentleman come to that topic." "I shall come to that soon enough for you," replied he, shaking his finger at him in acceptance of his challenge. His Old School friends almost held their breaths with anxiety, as they said to themselves: "Will his performance be, indeed, able to come up to this audacious pledge?" But when, in the regular order of his reply, he reached the favorite premise of Dr. Peters, he exploded it with a happy power, and clear light, which formed the climax of his victory, and silenced his adversary effectually. Meantime he took occasion to exact of Dr. Peters a good natured revenge for his discourtesy. Seeing him anxiously fumbling a law-book introduced by the judge, and by him promised to Mr. Anderson, he reached his hand for it, saying in a sotto-voce audible to the whole house: "Give it me: raw hands ought not to meddle with edged tools." At this, the inimitable humor of his expressive countenance convulsed the audience with laughter.



When he closed his remarks, the person selected by the Old School to ask the previous question, felt that no other argument could be so effective, and at once performed his appointed task. The house was apparently satisfied also: the call was granted, and the majority which voted with the Old School showed, that Mr. Anderson had decided every mind which wavered. All, except Virginians, were startled and amazed at this display of his powers. The Northern people about the Assembly, especially, asked themselves: How comes it that this great master of debate has been hitherto unheard of by us? They said, his powers, like those of Pallas, must have sprung at one leap from their infancy to their adult vigor. But this was all mistaken. Mr. Anderson now exhibited no other powers, than those which, in his happier occasions, his compeers were often accustomed to witness in him at the bar of Prince Edward. In this ecclesiastical debate, he had a subject suited to his faculties and taste: a great principle of constitutional law. His mastery over it, and the amazing contrast between his handling of it and that of his Northern adversaries, was but an illustration of the superior civic culture prevalent among the gentlemen of Virginia, and, yet more, of their deeper veneration for constitutional bonds.

This interesting incident has been described at this length, only because of its éclat without his own circle. In the Synod of Virginia, he sustained the reforms of 1837, with equal eloquence. For a number of years, indeed, as long as health allowed, he was an interested and influential member of church courts in his own State, and his helping hand was in every good work. Thus he passed along for fifteen years more, busy in his laborious profession, and frequently charged with public trusts for church and State.

About the year 1852, his robust frame was shattered by an attack of paralysis. For a time, he lay motionless, and incapable of speech, and, as others supposed, unconscious. But he said afterwards, that the sense of hearing, the powers of thought, and the sensibility to pain, were even unnaturally active: and at the very moment that he heard the anxious friends around his bed congratulating him on this sad advantage, that he was at least insensible to suffering, he was enduring not only bodily pain, but a wringing of the nerves unspeakably more

agonizing than mere pain. His experience suggests the truth, which nurses and ministers of religion should bear in mind, that oftentimes consciousness and the powers of attention are awake in the sick, where they have the ability to "give no sign." Had the consolations of religion been addressed to Mr. Anderson at that hour, he would have appreciated them fully, although utterly unable to signify it, by voice, or motion of an eyelid, or a muscle. This alarming disease was, however, arrested, and by virtue of his temperance and sanity of constitution, it left no after-consequences, except a tremor of the hands, which gradually grew with the advances of age.

Mr. Anderson at once felt this, as a distinct summons to "set his house in order." He did not demit any of the active duties of life; but anticipating some sudden return of his malady, he made his account to die with his harness on. Yet there was a great increase of the depth, tenderness, and devotion of his Christian character. He still frequented, as before, the old law office in the corner of his shrubbery, which had for so long been the scene of active bustle, and the haunt of a throng of clients. But his tremulous hand refused even to write a legal instrument: and the laborious duties of his profession were turned over to a young kinsman, who had become his partner, afterwards known and lamented, as the distinguished Colonel John S. Thornton. Those who visited Mr. Anderson, in these later years, in his office, were almost sure to find him reading his old quarto Bible. This became the constant, the almost exclusive occupation of his leisure. Pencil in hand, he dwelt deliberately upon each clause, signifying his appreciation of those which struck him as peculiarly weighty, by a broad mark drawn underneath. Going over his Bible thus, again and again, it gradually became blackened all over with these marks, to an almost incredible extent. This old Bible is now treasured up, as a curious and affecting memorial of his diligence in the study of the Word. The maturing of grace in his character was also most marked in his prayers, at the domestic altar, and in the prayer meetings of the church, which he so much loved to frequent, as long as his infirmities allowed. His devotions were peculiar for the profound, and yet triumphant tone of reverence and adoration, and the holy importunity, which pervaded them more and more. To every spiritually-minded Christian,

it was a treat, a refreshment, to hear Mr. Anderson lead in prayer.

When his infirmities increased, a transaction occurred between him and his law-partner, Mr. Thornton, equally honorable to both. He had taken this young kinsman into his office when he was first licensed; and he had rapidly grown into high favor with the people. Mr. Anderson now volunteered to declare to him, that their partnership must be dissolved. "I am but a burden to you now," he added. "You do all the work, and endure the hardships: you are virtually supporting my family, as well as your own; and it is not just that I should allow you to burden yourself with such an incubus, in your ascending career. You must set up for yourself, so as to advance unimpeded by me." When Mr. Anderson proposed this, he well knew that its execution would consign him almost to penury: for his generous and almost profuse spirit had left him no accumulations from his years of arduous labor. But Mr. Thornton positively refused to accede to the dissolution of the partnership; urging that Mr. Anderson's present enjoyment of the moiety of the earnings of the firm was but a just return for his princely generosity, in according to him the same share, at the beginning; when he was but a stripling, without professional patronage or experience; and that, if Mr. Anderson no longer did his half of the riding, writing, and speaking, yet his wisdom in counsel, and his moral weight, were still richly worth their pay. In this generous strife, both seemed for a time equally obstinate; but at last the obstinacy of Thornton prevailed; and amidst Mr. Anderson's growing infirmities, the partnership continued, until the approach of the war indicated that the former was to be called to other scenes of usefulness.

In this great contest for the independence of Virginia, Mr. Anderson was a consistent and ardent supporter of his native State. Just in proportion to his piety, ripening for heaven, was the clearness and steadfastness of his devotion to the great constitutional rights, which, he believed, were about to be overthrown. His embarrassed affairs and growing decrepitude left him little else that he could do for his country, except to counsel, to pray, and to suffer. Most nobly did he do all these; and especially the latter. To his friends, it was one of the most touching incidents of the calamities of the country, to see such

a man, whose liberal hand had solaced so many, reduced, by the depreciation of the currency, and other difficulties of the time, to the verge of want. But he bore every privation with a cheerful, modest dignity, beautiful to behold, and instructive to all younger men. Always hopeful, ever courageous, he was a stay and stimulus to all whom he met; and when he crept out to the Court House hard by, leaning on his staff, to speak a word of cheer to the people, and leave his benediction with them, the fire of better years was rekindled in his eye, and the old walls recognized again the sonorous echo of that voice, which was wont to peal there, when the lion of the bar had trodden his stage, and shaken his kingly mane at the enemies of country and right, in the days of his strength. But that mane was now white as the snows of the hoary Alps; and the tread of his stalwart limbs was slower and slower. His orb was steadily approaching its western horizon, serenely, and brightly, despite the war-clouds whose angry and thickening folds had usurped the place of that peaceful, glowing sunset, which we would have desired to close the evening of such a career as his. Then came suddenly, the fall of his country; and at that blow, his spirit said, "It is enough," and sank instantly to its rest: to rise again in the eternal heavens.

On the night of Sunday, April 2nd, General Lee silently evacuated Richmond and Petersburg, and began his arduous and doubtful retreat towards the waters of the Roanoke. Mr. Anderson heard even this appalling news, with a steadfast heart: he still refused to despair of the Republic: and in the immediate prospect of passing, with his home and family, into the lines of the enemy, his spirit was as unshaken and composed as ever. The morning of Friday, the 7th, the quiet village was overwhelmed by the sudden irruption of the Federal cavalry, who, in an instant, spread themselves everywhere, plundering and ravaging. Mr. Anderson was arrested, and led across the street before one of their generals, who attempted to carry him through a harsh and unfeeling catechism concerning the movements of the retreating Confederates, and the routes of the country. He answered, with quiet dignity, that if they would observe him, his obvious infirmities, at least, would show them a reason why such information should not be demanded of him. Brutality itself could find no pretext to harrass such a victim,

and he was coldly dismissed. He returned to his dwelling to find it filled from garret to cellar, with a rabble of troopers, defiling and pilfering everything with their unclean hands. Seeing that corporeal resistance was simply mad, and that there was no spark of principle or compunction in such breasts, to which to appeal, he judged that his self-respect would be best consulted by perfect quiet. Where a righteous defense was impossible, he disdained to complain. But the insult, the unutterable indignation, were too much for his tottering frame. He was soon no longer able to direct his steps, and betook himself to his bed. Here he lay, with a quiet spirit, engaged in silent prayer, receiving the cares of his beloved wife and sister with a tender and gushing thankfulness, still hiding them to be of good courage in their God. The neighborhood was so filled, and every house so beset, during all these days, with plunderers, that it was almost impossible for the few males out of the army, to leave their own doors, to render the common offices of humanity to a neighbor. But the chivalrous women braved every inconvenience, and gave the needed assistance. On the next Tuesday, the news of General Lee's final surrender was brought to Mr. Anderson. This was, literally, the final blow to his feeble body. Thenceforward, the expectation and the desire of life were extinguished—he calmly said: "It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth to him good"; and, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." Yes, in peace! although the ruins of a fallen country were crashing around his dying bed. Thus, on Tuesday, the 18th of April, he calmly and devoutly committed his soul to God, gave up the ghost, and was gathered unto his fathers.

A few days after (it was the very day that the pompous obsequies of Lincoln, and the popular phrensy were filling Washington City with tumult); a handful of his neighbors, with the pastors and elders, sadly and silently conveyed his venerable remains to their resting place at the College Church. In peaceful times, his fellow citizens would have delighted to honor him with such a funeral cortege as country places had rarely witnessed. Now, there was none; the people had just been robbed of every beast of burden; and the young men were either in bloody graves, or in captivity, or fleeing before their enemies. But it is sufficient consolation to know, that the song

of the angels was not therefore the less rapturous, as his ransomed spirit entered heaven's gates: and that the hallowed dust sleeps none the less safely in the Redeemer's keeping, until the resurrection.

To human apprehension, it would have been happy for Mr. Anderson to live until the deliverance of the country he loved so ardently was accomplished: and to render up his rejoicing spirit to God amidst peaceful liberty. But seeing it has been determined by his sovereign and awful Providence, that Virginia should submit to bondage, the time of our friend's departure was most excellently chosen. He went away to the mightily dead with the vanishing glories of his country. The great Deliverer stepped in, and with his imperial sceptre, forbade that any bonds should alight upon his free spirit. He had ever lived a freeman; and now he was forever enfranchised by death. How much are they to be envied, who having been made meet for "the inheritance of the saints in light," are permitted thus to receive the fulfillment of the prayer of Jackson: "that we may not be required to survive the independence of our country."

When the convulsions of the times permitted it, the most honorable testimonials to his memory were adopted by the Session of his church, the court and bar of Prince Edward county, and the other public bodies with which he had been connected.

## WOMEN'S RIGHTS WOMEN.<sup>1</sup>

---

In our day, innovations march with so rapid a stride that they quite take away one's breath. The fantastical project of yesterday, which was mentioned only to be ridiculed, is to-day the audacious reform, and will be to-morrow the accomplished fact. Such has been the history of the agitation for "women's rights," as they are sophistically called in this country. A few years ago this movement was the especial hobby of a few old women of both sexes, who made themselves the laughing-stock of all sane people by the annual ventilation of their crotchet. Their only recruits were a few of the unfortunates whom nature or fortune had debarred from those triumphs and enjoyments which are the natural ambition of the sex, and who adopted this agitation as the most feasible mode of expressing their spitefulness against the successful competitors. To-day the movement has assumed such dimensions that it challenges the attention of every thoughtful mind.

If we understand the claims of the Women's Rights women, they are in substance two: that the legislation, at least, of society shall disregard all the natural distinctions of the sexes, and award the same specific rights and franchises to both in every respect; and that woman while in the married state shall be released from every species of conjugal subordination. The assimilation of the garments of the two sexes, their competition in the same industries and professions, and their common access to the same amusements and recreations, are social changes which the "strong-minded" expect to work, each one for herself, when once the obstructions of law are removed from the other points.

One result of the reflection which we have been able to give this movement, is the conviction that it will prevail in the so-called "United States." This is foreshadowed by the frantic lust for innovation which has seized the body of the people like

an epidemic. It is enough with them to condemn any institution, that it was bequeathed us by our forefathers; because it is not the invention of this age, it is wrong, of course. In their eyes no experience proves anything, save the experience which they have had themselves. They do not suppose that our fathers were wise enough to interpret and record the lessons of former experiences. That certain things did not succeed in our forefathers' hands is no proof that they will not succeed in our hands; for we are "cute," we live in an enlightened age, and understand how to manage things successfully. The philosophy of the Yankee mind is precisely that of the Yankee girl who, when she asked for leave to marry at seventeen, was dissuaded by her mother that she "had married very early and had seen the folly of it." "Yes; but, Mamma," replied the daughter, "I want to see the folly of it for myself." Your Yankee philosopher is too self-sufficient to be cautioned from the past. He does not know history; he would not believe its conclusions if he did; he has no use for its lights, having enough "subjective" light of his own. To such a people the fact that a given experiment is too absurd to have been ever tried before, is an irresistible fascination: it is a chance not to be neglected.

The symptoms of approaching success which already exist are such as may well cheer the advocates of the new revolution. They who a few years ago counted their adherents by scores, now have tens of thousands. They are represented by their own press. They have received the support of at least one religious journal, which presumes to call itself Christian and is the organ of a numerous denomination—the *New York Independent*. They receive the obsequious homage of the demagogues of the day. They have already engrafted a part of their ideas upon some State constitutions. Their apostles are invited to lecture before "Christian Associations" (of that peculiar kind which enumerate billiard and card-tables among the means of grace), and before the United States Congress. And last, a kindred cause, that of indiscriminate divorces, is making such progress in many of the States that it will soon be able to lend a strong helping-hand to its sister. Now it is by just such steps that Radicalism grew from its despised infancy in this country. It was just thus that Abolitionism grew. It is thus that all



things grow on the American soil which ripen their harvests of evil.

The advocates of these "women's rights" may be expected to win the day, because the premises from which they argue their revolution have been irrevocably admitted by the bulk of the people. Now this popular mind may not be consciously or intentionally consistent and logical. It may jump to many conclusions without much analysis of the steps by which they are reached. It may deliberately harbor the most express purpose to be guilty of any logical inconsistency, however outrageous, in pursuing its supposed interests; and may have its mind ever so clearly made up to eat its own words and principles whenever its convenience prompts that measure. But still the Creator has made man, in spite of himself, a logical animal; and consequences will work themselves out, whether he designs it or not, to those results which the premises dictate. History will write out the corollaries of the theorems whether the projectors wish to stop for them or not. Now, false principles are already firmly planted from which the whole "Women's Rights" claim must follow. If we look at the coarser, more concrete, and popular form in which the consequence is drawn, we find the argument for the popular, Radical mind perfectly unanswerable. "It has been decided that all negro men have a right to vote: is not a Yankee white woman with her 'smartness' and education as good as a stupid, ignorant, Southern black?" We should like to see the answer to that logic from that premise which a Northern Radical mind could be made to appreciate. An unanswerable point thus perpetually made upon the mind of the public, will impinge at last.

Or if we examine the argument in its more exact and logical form, we shall find it, after the established (false) premises are granted, equally conclusive for the educated. The very axioms of American politics now are, that "all men are by nature equal," that all are inalienably "entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and that "the only just foundation of government is in the consent of the governed." There was a sense in which our fathers propounded these statements; but it is not the one in which they are now held by Americans. Our recent doctors of political science have retained these formulas of words as convenient masks under which to circulate a

set of totally different, and indeed antagonistic notions; and they have succeeded perfectly. The new meanings of which the "Whigs" of 1776 never dreamed are now the current ones. Those wise statesmen meant to teach that all men are morally equal in the sense of the Golden Rule: that while individual traits, rights, and duties vary widely in the different orders of political society, these different rights all have some moral basis; that the inferior has the same moral title (that of a common humanity and common relation to a benignant Heavenly Father) to have his rights—the rights of an inferior—duly respected, which the superior has to claim that his very different rights shall be respected. The modern version is that there are no superiors or inferiors in society; that there is a mechanical equality; that all have specifically all the same rights; and that any other constitution is against natural justice. Next: when our wise fathers said that liberty is an inalienable, natural right, they meant by each one's liberty the privilege to do such things as he, with his particular relations, ought to have a moral title to do; the particular things having righteous, natural limitations in every case, and much narrower limits in some cases than in others. Radical America now means by natural liberty each one's privilege to do what he chooses to do. By the consent of the governed our forefathers meant each Sovereign Commonwealth's consenting to the constitution under which it should be governed: they meant that it was unjust for Britain to govern America without America's consent. Which part of the human beings living in a given American State should constitute the State potentially, the populus whose franchise it was to express the will of the commonwealth for all—that was in their eyes wholly another question; to be wisely decided in different States according to the structure which Providence had given them. By "the consent of the governed" it would appear that Radicalism means it is entirely just for Yankeedom to govern Virginia against Virginia's consent, and that it is not just to govern any individual human being without letting him vote for his governors. The utter inconsistency of the two parts of this creed is not ours to reconcile. It is certain that both parts (consistent or not) are firmly held as the American creed. The version given to the maxim as to individual rights is universally this: that natural justice requires that suffrage shall

be coextensive with allegiance, except where the right has been forfeited by some crime (such as that which the men of 1861 committed in presuming to act on the principles of the men of 1776). To these errors the American people are too deeply committed to evade any of their logical applications. For the sake of these dogmas they have destroyed one Federal and eleven other State constitutions, have committed a half million of murders, and (dearest of all) have spent some seven thousand millions of dollars. Repudiate these maxims now! Never! This would be to dishonor the ghosts of all the slaughtered Union-Savers; to shame the sacrifices of all the "Trooly Lo'il" during the glorious four years, to dim the very crown of martyrdom upon the brow of the "late lamented," and worst of all, to outrage the manes of all those departed dollars.

Now then, when Mistress Amazona Narragansett steps forward, and having vindicated her claim to have belonged always to the true Israel of the "Unconditional Unionists," demands a simple and obvious application of these honored maxims to her own case, how can she be gainsaid? Hitherto the State has governed her without asking her consent at the ballot-box. This is self-evidently against the immortal truth that "all just government is founded on the consent of the governed." The State has restrained her natural liberty of doing as she chose, compelling her to pay a great many dollars in taxes which she would rather have chosen to expend in crinoline, and forbidding her to do a great many other little acts, such as bigamy, etc., which might have been her preference (and therefore her natural right); and all this without even saving the State's credit and manners by asking her consent at the polls to the laws made for her. And last: the State has committed the crowning outrage and inconsistency of not letting her be a man because God made her a woman! What an outrage this to be committed on so frivolous a pretext! Be consoled, Mistress Amazona; it is simply impossible that such abuses can stand much longer in the full light of this reforming age. "The school-mistress is abroad." That mighty tide of progress which has already swept away the Constitution, and slavery, and State's rights, and the force of contracts public and private, with all such rubbish, will soon dissolve your grievance also. Has not the Radical version of the political gospel said, "All men are by nature

mechanically equal?" And "man," Mistress Amazona (as you will know when you acquire the virile right of learning Latin) here means, not *vir*, but *home*; the species irrespective of sex. It means that a woman has a natural right to do all the particular things that a man does (if she can), to sit on juries and shave her beard, to serve in the army and ride astraddle, to preach sermons and sing bass.

But seriously: a woman is a human being, and a grown woman is an adult. She is treated, and must be treated, by all governments as a citizen owing allegiance and subject to law. On those principles, which are the first principles of Radicalism, it is impossible to deny her right to vote and to participate in all the franchises of men. Her exclusion is a glaring instance of "class legislation"—that odious thing which Radicalism so strongly condemns as contrary to equality. To subject women to these disabilities is even a more glaring injustice than was the exclusion of the negro from American citizenship because he was "guilty of a skin"; for here the exclusion from natural rights is grounded on the sole fact that woman is "guilty of a sex." And especially are all those laws unnatural and inexcusable iniquities which subject the person or property of the wife to any marital authority. What is such marriage but a species of (white) domestic slavery? Nor is it any excuse to say that in America no woman enters the married state save at her own option; for to that state the most commanding instincts of woman's being impel her; and it is but a mocking tyranny to impose this slavery on the married state of woman, and tell her then that she need not submit to the yoke if she chooses to avoid it by sacrificing the chief instincts of her being. Why, it may be even said to the galley-slave that he need not be a slave, provided he is willing to disregard that other primal instinct, the love of life: suicide will set him free!

Such is the logic of the Women's Rights party, from Radical premises. Its prospect of triumph is greatly increased by this, that its Northern opponents (the only ones who have any power to oppose) have disabled themselves from meeting it by their furious Abolitionism. The premises of that doctrine, to which they are so irrevocably committed, now shut their mouths. It is vain for the rabid negrophilist, Dr. Horace Bushnell, to write a book at this date against Women's Rights as the

"Reform against Nature." He cannot consistently oppose it; he has himself naturalized the false principles from which that "reform" will flow. The true principles from which its folly might have been evinced, the principles held by us "Rebels," he has trampled down with the armed heel, and drowned in blood and buried under mountains of obloquy and odium and slander. He cannot resort to those sound premises. To meet the argument of these aspiring Amazons fairly, one must teach, with Moses, the Apostle Paul, John Hampden, Washington, George Mason, John C. Calhoun, and all that contemptible rabble of "old fogies," that political society is composed of "superiors, inferiors, and equals"; that while all these bear an equitable moral relation to each other, they have very different natural rights and duties; that just government is not founded on the consent of the individuals governed, but on the ordinance of God, and hence a share in the ruling franchise is not a natural right at all, but a privilege to be bestowed according to a wise discretion on a limited class having qualification to use it for the good of the whole; that the integers out of which the State is constituted are not individuals, but families represented in their parental heads; that every human being is born under authority (parental and civic) instead of being born "free" in the licentious sense that liberty is each one's privilege of doing what he chooses; that subordination, and not that license, is the natural state of all men; and that without such equitable distribution of different duties and rights among the classes naturally differing in condition, and subordination of some to others, and of all to the law, society is as impossible as is the existence of a house without distinction between the foundation-stone and the cap-stones. No words are needed to show hence that should either the voice of God or of sound experience require woman to be placed for the good of the whole society in a subordinate sphere, there can be no natural injustice in doing so. But these old truths, with their sound and beneficent applications, have been scornfully repudiated by Abolitionism and Radicalism. The North cannot, will not, avow and appeal to them, because that would be to confess that the injured South was all the time right in its opposition to Abolition; and the conquerors will rather let all perish than thus humble their pride to the poor conquered victims.

It may be inferred again that the present movement for women's rights will certainly prevail from the history of its only opponent, Northern conservatism. This is a party which never conserves anything. Its history has been that it demurs to each aggression of the progressive party, and aims to save its credit by a respectable amount of growling, but always acquiesces at last in the innovation. What was the resisted novelty of yesterday is to-day one of the accepted principles of conservatism; it is now conservative only in affecting to resist the next innovation, which will to-morrow be forced upon its timidity and will be succeeded by some third revolution, to be denounced and then adopted in its turn. American conservatism is merely the shadow that follows Radicalism as it moves forward towards perdition. It remains behind it, but never retards it, and always advances near its leader. This pretended salt hath utterly lost its savor: wherewith shall it be salted? Its impotency is not hard, indeed, to explain. It is worthless because it is the conservatism of expediency only, and not of sturdy principle. It intends to risk nothing serious for the sake of the truth, and has no idea of being guilty of the folly of martyrdom. It always—when about to enter a protest—very blandly informs the wild beast whose path it essays to stop, that its “bark is worse than its bite,” and that it only means to save its manners by enacting its decent *role* of resistance. The only practical purpose which it now subserves in American politics is to give enough exercise to Radicalism to keep it “in wind,” and to prevent its becoming puffy and lazy from having nothing to whip. No doubt, after a few years, when women's suffrage shall have become an accomplished fact, conservatism will tacitly admit it into its creed, and thenceforward plume itself upon its wise firmness in opposing with similar weapons the extreme of baby suffrage; and when that too shall have been won, it will be heard declaring that the integrity of the American Constitution requires at least the refusal of suffrage to asses. There it will assume, with great dignity, its final position.

Indeed, as De Tocqueville predicted, innovations in the direction of extensions of suffrage will always be successful in America, because of the selfish timidity of her public men. It is the nature of ultra democracy to make all its politicians time-

servers; its natural spawn is the brood of narrow, truckling, cowardly worshippers of the *vox populi*, and of present expediency. Their polar star is always found in the answer to the question, "Which will be the more popular?" As soon as any agitation of this kind goes far enough to indicate a possibility of success, their resistance ends. Each of them begins to argue thus in his private mind:—"The proposed revolution is of course preposterous, but it will be best for me to leave opposition to it to others. For if it succeeds, the newly enfranchised will not fail to remember the opponents of their claim at future elections, and to reward those who were their friends in the hour of need." Again: it has now become a regular trick of American demagogues in power to manufacture new classes of voters to sustain them in office. It is presumed that the gratitude of the newly enfranchised will be sufficient to make them vote the ticket of their benefactors. But as gratitude is a very flimsy sort of fabric among Radicals, and soon worn threadbare, such a reliance only lasts a short time, and requires to be speedily replaced. The marvelous invention of negro suffrage (excogitated for this sole purpose) sufficed to give Radicalism a new four years' lease of life; but the grateful allegiance of the freedmen to their pretended liberators is waxing very thin; and hence the same expedient must be repeated, in the form of creating a few millions of female votes. The designing have an active, selfish motive for pushing the measure; but its opponents will without fail be paralyzed in their resistance by their wonted cowardice; so that success is sure.

This expectation is greatly confirmed by a review of the history of past innovations. They have all been carried against the better judgment of the class in the country to whom the Constitution committed the power of deciding for or against them. In 1829-1830, the State of Virginia took her first departure from the old principle of freeholders' suffrage. In 1851 she completed that revolution (as well as introduced sundry other Radical features) by extending the right to vote indiscriminately to all white males. In both instances it was hard to find a freeholder, not a demagogue, who could avow a hearty preference for the changes. They were carried against the convictions of the voters by the influences which have been above described. It is most probable that the same thing was true in

every State which adopted universal suffrage. The coercive measures of the Federal Government were undoubtedly precipitated against the convictions of the majority of the Northern people. So the war was transmuted into an Abolition measure under the same circumstances. And last: negro suffrage was undoubtedly introduced against the better judgment of nearly all by the selfish arts of the demagogues; and as there was neither party nor statesman that had the nerve to head the almost universal opposition, the decision went by default. Nor will there be, under any future circumstances, either leader or party that will risk the odium of a movement to take away suffrage from the incompetent hands of the blacks, however clearly it may appear that they are using it for the ruin of themselves and the country. Thus it is the destiny of the Yankee people to commit a species of political Hari-kari with its own unwilling hands. The crowning element of despair is in the enforced consolidation of the Government. There are no reserved rights of States. The mad innovation which is adopted by a majority of them is enforced upon all; so that no place of refuge is left in the whole land where the right principles and usages might find sanctuary, and abide as a wholesome example and recuperative power for reform.

What then, in the next place, will be the effect of this fundamental change when it shall be established? The obvious answer is, that it will destroy Christianity and civilization in America. Some who see the mischievousness of the movement express the hope that it will, even if nominally successful, be kept within narrow limits by the very force of its own absurdity. They "reckon without their host." There is a Satanic ingenuity in these Radical measures which secures the infection of the reluctant dissentients as surely as of the hot advocates. The women now sensible and modest who heartily deprecate the whole folly, will be dragged into the vortex, with the assent of their now indignant husbands. The instruments of this deplorable result will be the (so-called) conservative candidates for office. They will effect it by this plea, that ignorant, impudent, Radical women *will* vote, and vote wrong; whence it becomes a necessity for the modest and virtuous women, for their country's sake, to sacrifice their repugnance and counterpoise these mischievous votes in the spirit of disinterested self-



sacrifice. Now a woman can never resist an appeal to the principle of generous devotion; her glory is to crucify herself in the cause of duty and of zeal. This plea will be successful. But when the virtuous have once tasted the dangerous intoxication of political excitement and of power, even they will be absorbed; they will learn to do *con amore* what was first done as a painful duty, and all the baleful influences of political life will be diffused throughout the sex.

What those influences will be may be learned by every one who reverences the Christian Scriptures, from this fact, that the theory of "Women's Rights" is sheer infidelity. It directly impugns the authority and the justice of these Scriptures. They speak in no uncertain tones. "The husband is the head of the wife" (Eph. v. 23). "Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands, as to the Lord" (v. 22). "The man is not for the woman, but the woman for the man" (I. Cor. ii. 9). "Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection: but I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence: for Adam was first formed, then Eve: and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (I. Tim. 2: 11-14). They are to be "discreet, chaste, *keepers at home*, good, obedient to their own husbands," etc. (Titus ii. 5). How utterly opposed is all this to the levelling doctrine of your Radical. Women are here consigned to a social subordination, and expressly excluded from ruling offices, on grounds of their sex, and a divine ordination based by God upon a transaction which happened nearly six thousand years ago! The woman's sphere is expressly assigned her within her home, and she is taught that the assumption of publicity is an outrage against that nature with which she is endowed. Now the politics which denounce all this as a natural injustice and self-evident folly cannot be expected to reverence these Scriptures; they must and will flout their whole authority. We must then make up our minds in accepting Women's Rights to surrender our Bibles, and have an atheistic Government. And especially must we expect to have, presiding over every home and rearing every group of future citizens, that most abhorrent of all phenomena, an infidel woman; for of course that sex, having received the precious boon of their enfranchisement only by means of the

overthrow of the Bible, must be foremost in trampling upon this their old oppressor and enemy. Its restoration to authority is necessarily their "re-enslavement," to speak the language of their party.

Second: these new excitements and temptations will utterly corrupt the character and delicacy of American women. It is indignantly asked, "Why should politics corrupt the morals of women more than of the 'lords of creation'?" Suppose now we reply: American politics have corrupted the morals of the men? Suppose we argue that the retort is so true and just and the result has actually gone to so deplorable an extent, that were the female side of our social organization as corrupt as the male side has already become, American society would crumble into ruin by its own putrescence? It is better to save half the fabric than to lose all. And especially is it better to save the purity of the mothers who are, under God, to form the characters of our future citizens, and of the wives who are to restrain and elevate them, whatever else we endanger. Is it argued that since women are now confessedly purer than men, their entrance into politics must tend to purify politics? We reply again that the women of the present were reared and attained this comparative purity under the Bible system. Adopt the infidel plan, and we shall corrupt our women without purifying our politics. What shall save us then?

But there is another reply to this retort. Political excitements will corrupt women tenfold more than men; and this, not because women are naturally inferior to men, but because they are naturally adapted to a wholly different sphere. When we point to the fact that they are naturally more emotional and less calculating, more impulsive and less self-contained, that they have a quicker tact but less logic, that their social nature makes them more liable to the contagion of epidemic passions, and that the duties of their sex make it physically impossible for them to acquire the knowledge in a foreign sphere necessary for political duties, we do not depreciate woman; we only say that nature has adapted her to one thing and disqualified her for the other. The violet would wither in that full glare of mid-summer in which the sunflower thrives: this does not argue that the violet is the meaner flower. The vine, left to stand alone, would be hurled prone in the mire by the first blasts of that history. In the case of the Amorites there was also this wise

wind which strengthens the grasp of the sturdy oak upon its bed: still the oak may yield no fruit so precious as the clusters of the vine. But the vine cannot be an oak; it must be itself, dependent, clinging, but more precious than that on which it leans or it must perish. When anything, animate or inanimate, is used for a function to which it is not adapted, that foreign use must endamage it, and the more the farther that function is from its own sphere. So it will be found (and it is no disparagement to woman to say it) that the very traits which fit her to be the angel of a virtuous home unfit her to meet the agitations of political life, even as safely as does the more rugged man. The hot glare of publicity and passion will speedily deflower her delicacy and sweetness. Those temptations, which her Maker did not form her to bear, will debauch her heart, developing a character as much more repulsive than that of the debauched man as the fall has been greater. The politicking woman, unsexed and denaturalized, shorn of the true glory of her femininity, will appear to men as a feeble hybrid mannikin, with all the defects and none of the strength of the male. Instead of being the dear object of his chivalrous affection, she becomes his importunate rival, despised without being feared.

This suggests a third consequence, which some of the advocates of the movement even already are bold enough to foreshadow. "Women's Rights" mean the abolition of all permanent marriage ties. We are told that Mrs. Cady Stanton avowed this result, proclaiming it at the invitation of the Young Men's *Christian* Association of New York. She holds that woman's bondage is not truly dissolved until the marriage bond is annulled. She is thoroughly consistent. Some hoodwinked advocates of her revolution may be blind to the sequence; but it is inevitable. It must follow by this cause, if for no other, that the unsexed politicking woman can never inspire in man that true affection on which marriage should be founded. Men will doubtless be still sensual; but it is simply impossible that they can desire them for the pure and sacred sphere of the wife. Let every woman ask herself: will she choose for the lord of her affections an unsexed effeminate man? No more can man be drawn to the masculine woman. The mutual attraction of the two complementary halves is gone forever. The abolition

of marriage would follow again by another cause. The divergent interests and the rival independence of the two equal wills would be irreconcilable with domestic government, or union, or peace. Shall the children of this monstrous no-union be held responsible to two variant co-ordinate and supreme wills at once? Heaven pity the children! Shall the two parties to this perpetual co-partnership have neither the power to secure the performance of the mutual duties nor to dissolve it? It is a self-contradiction, an impossible absurdity. Such a co-partnership of equals with independent interests must be separable at will, as all other such co-partnerships are. The only relation between the sexes which will remain will be a cohabitation continuing so long as the convenience or caprice of both parties may suggest; and this, with most, will amount to a vagrant concubinage.

But now, what will be the character of the children reared under such a domestic organization as this? If human experience has established anything at all, it is the truth of that principle announced by the Hebrew prophet when he declared that the great aim of God in ordaining a permanent marriage tie between one man and one woman was "that He might seek a godly seed." God's ordinance, the only effective human ordinance for checking and curbing the first tendencies to evil, is domestic, parental government. When the family shall no longer have a head, and the great foundation for the subordination of children in the mother's example is gone; when the mother shall have found another sphere than her home for her energies; when she shall have exchanged the sweet charities of domestic love and sympathy for the fierce passions of the hustings; when families shall be disrupted at the caprice of either party, and the children scattered as foundlings from their hearthstone,—it requires no wisdom to see that a race of sons will be reared nearer akin to devils than to men. In the hands of such a bastard progeny, without discipline, without homes, without a God, the last remains of social order will speedily perish, and society will be overwhelmed in savage anarchy.

Last: it would not be hard to show, did space permit, that this movement on the part of these women is as suicidal as it is mischievous. Its certain result will be the re-enslavement of women, not under the Scriptural bonds of marriage, but under

the yoke of literal corporeal force. The woman who will calmly review the condition of her sex in other ages and countries will feel that her wisdom is to "let well enough alone." Physically, the female is the "weaker vessel." This world is a hard and selfish scene where the weaker goes to the wall. Under all other civilizations and all other religions than ours woman has experienced this fate to the full; her condition has been that of a slave to the male—sometimes a petted slave, but yet a slave. In Christian and European society alone has she ever attained the place of man's social equal, and received the homage and honor due from magnanimity to her sex and her feebleness. And her enviable lot among us has resulted from two causes: the Christian religion and the legislation founded upon it by feudal chivalry. How insane then is it for her to spurn these two bulwarks of defense, to defy and repudiate the divine authority of that Bible which has been her redemption, and to revolutionize the whole spirit of the English common law touching woman's sphere and rights? She is thus spurning the only protectors her sex has ever found, and provoking a contest in which she must inevitably be overwhelmed. Casting away that dependence and femininity which are her true strength, the "strong-minded woman" persists in thrusting herself into competition with man as his equal. But for contest she is not his equal; the male is the stronger animal. As man's rival, she is a pitiful inferior, a sorry she-mannikin. It is when she brings her wealth of affection, her self-devotion, her sympathy, her tact, her grace, her subtle intuition, her attractions, her appealing weakness, and places them in the scale with man's rugged strength and plodding endurance, with his steady logic, his hardihood and muscle, and his exemption from the disabling infirmities of her sex, that he delights to admit her full equality and to do glad homage to her as the crown of his kind. All this vantage-ground the "Women's Rights women" madly throw away, and provoke that collision for which nature itself has disqualified them. They insist upon taking precisely a man's chances; well, they will meet precisely the fate of a weak man among strong ones. A recent incident on a railroad train justly illustrates the result. A solitary female entered a car where every seat was occupied, and the conductor closed the door upon her and departed. She looked in vain for a seat, and at last

appealed to an elderly man near her to know if he would not "surrender his seat to a lady." He, it seems, was somewhat a humorist, and answered: "I will surrender it cheerfully, Madam, as I always do, but will beg leave first to ask a civil question. Are you an advocate of the modern theory of women's rights?" Bridling up with intense energy, she replied, "Yes, sir, emphatically; I let you know that it is my glory to be devoted to that noble cause." "Very well, Madam," said he, "then the case is altered: *You may stand up like the rest of us men, until you can get a seat for yourself.*" This was exact poetic justice; and it foreshadows precisely the fate of their unnatural pretensions. Men will treat them as they treat each other; it will be "every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." There will be of course a Semiramis or a Queen Bess here and there who will hold her own; but the general rule will be that the "weaker vessels" will succumb; and the society which will emerge from this experiment will present woman in the position which she has always held among savages, that of domestic drudge to the stronger animal. Instead of being what the Bible makes her, one with her husband, queen of his home, reigning with the gentle sceptre of love over her modest, secluded domain, and in its pure and sacred retirement performing the noblest work done on this earth, that of moulding infant minds to honor and piety, she will reappear from this ill-starred competition defeated and despised, tolerated only to satiate the passion, to amuse the idleness, to do the drudgery, and to receive the curses and blows of her barbarized masters.

Thus will be consummated that destiny to which so many gloomy prognostics point as the allotment of the North American continent: to be the accursed field for the final illustration of the harvest of perdition, grown from the seeding of the dragon's teeth of infidel Radicalism. God gave the people of this land great and magnificent blessings, and opportunities and responsibilities. They might and should have made it the glory of all lands. But they have betrayed their trust: they have abused every gift: above all have they insulted him by flaunting in his face an impudent, atheistic, God-defying theory of pretended human rights and human perfectibility which attempts to deny man's subordination, his dependence, his fall and native depravity, his need of divine grace. It invites mankind

to adopt material civilization and sensual advantage as their divinity. It assumes to be able to perfect man's condition by its political, literary, and mechanical skill, despising that Gospel of Christ which is man's only adequate remedy. It crowns its impiety by laying its defiling hands upon the very forms of that Christianity, while with the mock affection of a Judas it attempts to make it a captive to the sordid ends of Mammon and sense. Must not God be avenged on such a nation as this? His vengeance will be to give them the fruit of their own hands, and let them be filled with their own devices. He will set apart this fair land by a sort of dread consecration to the purpose of giving a lesson concerning this godless philosophy, so impressive as to instruct and warn all future generations. As the dull and pestilential waves of the Dead Sea have been to every subsequent age the memento of the sin of Sodom, so the dreary tides of anarchy and barbarism which will overwhelm the boastful devices of infidel democracy will be the caution of all future legislators. And thus "women's rights" will assist America "to fulfil her great mission," that of being the "scarecrow" of the nations.

## THE LATEST INFIDELITY.

---

### A REPLY TO INGERSOLL'S POSITIONS.

---

The phase of infidelity most current among those who do not profess to accept the gospel is marked by two qualities: It is aggressive, and it is extreme. It refuses to stop short of that last result, blank atheism, or, at least, blank agnosticism, from which even the skepticism of previous ages recoiled with abhorrence. This ultraism of the present adversaries is in one respect very shocking; but in another it is promising. They are practically teaching the world that conclusion, on which James Mills justified his atheism, that when once a man's sense rejects the gospel theory, he finds no stopping place between that rejection and atheism; because, as Bishop Butler has forever established, every difficulty which besets the old gospel plan equally embarrasses the deistic plan. This disclosure is useful. Our atheists are teaching people that there is no decent middle ground for them to stand on; but the voice of nature and conscience never permits decent people to stand long on the ground of atheism. This outrages both head and heart too horribly. Were a son to insist, contrary to sufficient evidence of the fact, upon denying and discarding the very existence of his father, we see plainly enough how his position involves every phase of filial transgression, because it involves the absolute neglect of every filial duty. The position may involve, in the form of a sin of omission, the crime of parricide. The atheist discards the very existence of his heavenly Father; so, unless he has justified his denial by sound evidence, he includes in that act every sin of impiety. We see here the simple reason why the good sense of mankind has always regarded atheism with moral abhorrence. But this is the creed which the assailants of our day prefer to urge upon us, and that with boundless



audacity. Colonel Robert Ingersoll seems to be the leader who holds this "bad eminence" amidst this host; he seems ambitious of a large share of this dreadful responsibility. This fact justifies my occasional reference to his name as representing the code of opinions I propose to discuss.

His various essays and speeches—especially his recent large essay in the *North American Review*—appear to build his opposition to Christianity upon four grounds: One is composed of specific objections to points in Bible history and precept, which, he intimates, intuitively appear to him immoral. Another is his assertion of moral irresponsibility for opinions even upon ethical subjects. This he claims for himself, and of course for everybody else, as the only adequate basis for freedom of thought, which we all regard as an inalienable right. A third ground is his total denial of all punitive aspect and quality in the evil consequences of free human actions. He absolutely denies the element of rewards and punishments in the experienced course of human existence. He says that the evils which follow the mistakes of our free agency are nothing but natural consequences, following from the natural laws of the universe, which are necessary and invariable; so that these experiences give no evidence whatever of a moral providence over men. His fourth and chief ground is the old cavil, how God, if there were a God, could even permissively ordain natural and moral evil in his kingdom.

I. The first class of assaults I propose to follow to a very short distance. They could be all disposed of by pointing to the dense ignorance of their authors concerning the Bible, its real facts and its real doctrines. They are such criticisms as their authors would never have made had they read their Bibles with attention and candor. They are all absolutely exploded by simple explanations which the teachers of the church have been accustomed for generations to give even to the children of their Bible classes. It would be wearisome and useless to go over all of this thoroughly-trodden ground. One or two points will serve for illustration. In general I would only remark, that it would be well for the critics to get some little knowledge of the Christian literature before exposing themselves in a way both ludicrous and pitiable, by attacking subjects about which they have been too proud to learn anything.

For instance, we are hotly told by one that Joshua must have been a very wicked man, because he not only punished Achan capitally for disobeying a police regulation, but murdered his wife and children along with him. But the old testament makes Joshua a very pious hero; wherefore it also is a very wicked and foolish book. The simple and sufficient reply is, that the execution of Achan's family was none of Joshua's doings. He had no more discretion about it than about Noah's flood. God was the agent, and Joshua his merely involuntary instrument. So that the moral question in the given case resolves itself into this: Has Almighty God a right to punish a contumacious and immoral family of his creatures with death for a special wise end, death being the final just penalty of all sin? No man, after provisionally admitting the condition of this question, even for argument's sake, is silly enough to assert that, if there is such a God, such retribution from him would be necessarily unjust. Or, do they reinforce their cavil by saying there is no evidence that Achan's wife and children were accomplices in his theft? The simple reply is, that undoubtedly God knew them to be a bad family, worthy on general grounds of his eternal displeasure. For the principle of imputation on which this case proceeds is that God righteously imputes part of the guilt of wicked parents to children, but only to wicked children.\* So that we are certain the family also was vicious and disobedient. Had God punished them some years after with death, or rheumatism, or cholera, nobody who admits that there is a God, would have dreamed of impugning the justice of that providential dispensation. Who, then, can blame the Sovereign Judge if, for the sake of an important and wise object, he anticipated the deserved punishment and connected it with that of the criminal head of the family? But I also deny the asserted ground of the cavil, that persons were punished along with Achan who, however otherwise sinful, were innocent of his particular breach of military orders. No doubt they were implicated with him by receiving and concealing the plunder. The receiver is as bad as the thief. If there were infants in the family, death removed them to the bliss of heaven.

---

\*Ex. xx. 5; Ezek. xviii.

Or, they object to Joshua's invasion of Palestine, and charge that his war of extermination there showed him no better than a land pirate and a murderer; and that, as the Old Testament represents God as sanctioning these horrors, they feel intuitively it is a very wicked book. I reply, that here a very large sophism is foisted in under a very small jugglery of words. This shallow little trick consists in the phrase "God sanctioned," instead of "God ordained." Thus it injects into the mind this conception of the transaction: that after Joshua, a human sinner, who had no right to dispose of other people's property and lives, had conceived his murderous project, God granted it his approval. Of course that would be exceedingly ugly. But the actual fact is that Joshua never conceived the plan at all. The war of extermination against the Amorites was no plan of Joshua's. There is not a particle of proof that he ever thought he as a mere man had any right to dispose of other people's property and lives. The plan of extermination was God's alone. He dictated it to Joshua. And again we say this general had no more discretion about it than he had about God's infliction of the deluge. God's purpose employed Joshua as a mere executioner; and if the Sovereign Judge had a right to pass the decree, it is nonsense to blame the mere servant who was compelled to execute it. The logic of this accusation is just as silly as that of a man who, after admitting the righteousness of the laws of New York, should call Mr. Cleveland a murderer, because when he was sheriff at Buffalo he hung some convicted assassins. Now, then, the only question involved in this piece of history is, whether Almighty God has the right to punish a tribe of his own creatures, whose iniquity was now full, with the death penalty. We can get a pretty accurate conception of what the morals of these gross idolaters had become. Their habits, like those of other advanced idolaters, were doubtless defiled by every vile excess of lust, avarice, cruelty, unnatural affections, human sacrifice, infanticide. If God has any title at all to judge the world in righteousness, he certainly had a right to rid the world of this plague spot in his own way. He had adopted another instrumentality to burn out a similar plague-spot, Sodom, and he was justified for that by Jesus, by the apostles, and every honest man that ever read the

administrative reason for God's dealing: that he was planning to preserve a pure religion and morality in Israel, which required their effectual protection from the contamination of this pagan example.

Third, Colonel Ingersoll himself has been in the habit of attacking the Bible passionately, because he found that, when candidly explained, it countenanced slavery—the Old Testament actually ordaining it, and the New Testament allowing it. But inasmuch as slavery appears very abominable to his moral intuitions, this compels him to regard them as wicked books. Here, again, the critic's whole difficulty arises out of a sheer misconception. Let me ask him what that thing is which appears so evil; he defines it substantially thus: the usurpation by a stronger individual at his own violent will over the being of his weaker fellow-man, whereby the victim is reduced from a human personality, with a moral responsibility and destiny, to a mere chattel, a brute possession, whose labor, happiness and very existence may then be exhausted by the usurper for his own selfish behoof. I am happy to be able to console the critic by assuring him, first, that everybody else would abhor such a relation just as he does; and, second, that the two Testaments, instead of ordaining or allowing it, even adjudged it just as he and I do. And here is the triumphant proof that this very conception of the usurpation which Colonel Ingersoll erroneously supposes to be the conception of slavery, is precisely the crime which both Testaments condemn. (As in N. T. the act of the *andrapodistes*, and in O. T. *no'ebh ish*.) The Bible abhorred it so much that whilst Moses made only a few crimes capital he made this one of them; and the New Testament usually recites it along with the enormous wickednesses that incur the damnation of hell. What, then, was that relation of human bondage which Moses ordained and the apostles allowed? Not the usurpation of a personal will over a fellow-creature, not the reduction of the bondman from a responsible human person to a chattel (which injustice is nowhere countenanced or excused by Holy Scripture, or by any modern Christian that ever I heard of), but it was wholly another thing, to-wit: the regular institution, by the legislative sovereignty of the commonwealth, of a personal and domestic authority for life over the involuntary labor of the bondman, who was deemed by the law unfitted

for his own safe control, in the hands of a citizen supposed by the law to be more competent, and this authority to be exercised by the master under the restraints of statute-law, which also treated the bondman as a responsible agent, and guaranteed to him his life, limbs and subsistence against the aggression even of his master. Now, it is apparent that he would be a very bold man who would undertake to argue that this relation is essentially unjust, and the code which established it under any possible circumstances a wicked one. When arguing thus he would have to attack the righteousness of the parental authority over minors, and indeed every form of governmental restraint of magistrates over individuals not grounded in conviction of crime.

I have shown in these three specimens how completely they are exploded by a little tincture of Bible knowledge and common sense. I assert that all the other objections of this class can be shown to be equally worthless, but they are too numerous and trivial to detain the reader.

II. The second general ground for rejecting Christianity is the doctrine so dear to skeptics, that no man is morally responsible for any of the opinions which he sincerely holds. They assert that this position is the only basis for true intellectual freedom. They argue from it that our charge of sinfulness, or possibly impiety, or even our manifestation of moral disapproval against their most extreme speculations, is unjust, and is of the nature of wicked persecution of the free-thinkers. They also argue that the Christian system is absurd, in that it makes faith its cardinal condition for enjoying God's favor, inasmuch as no man's faith has any moral character, and cannot be a subject of moral responsibility, or approval or disapproval. Colonel Ingersoll is certain that to whatever extremes of atheism, or even of what appears to other people blasphemy, he is really led (not feignedly) by his thinking, he is as innocent therein as a man is for the color of his hair or the height of his stature. And here is his proof: that if the evidence appears before the mind, intellectual credence is purely involuntary, being the logical result of the evidence, and metaphysically necessitated; that such credence is exclusively the result of intellectual activities of the mind, with which neither emotion nor will has anything to do; that our responsibility is limited to

those acts of the spirit which have a voluntary source. So, he thinks, it would be as unjust to blame him for his atheistic conclusions to which his thought has led him, as to blame a man for being wet when he has been thrown into the water.

If he were not extremely ignorant of philosophy and theology he would be aware that this is but the old sophism in psychology, which has been a thousand times refuted. When we hear Colonel Ingersoll assert that his anti-Christian convictions are the fruit of his pure intellection, without any element of emotion or will, we picture to ourselves the huge laughter of his own votaries at so vast and obvious an irony; for their own eyes and ears tell them that his agnosticism is all passion. What means that labored torrent of fiery and vindictive eloquence with which he assails the theologians and the Bible? Do not his auditors hear him ascribe his opposition to the Scriptures in part to his passionate abhorrence of slavery? Do they not see hatred of Christianity and its restraints blazing amidst the whole frame-work of his pretended logic? His unbelief pure passionless intellection indeed! Why, he is incarnate passion! It is supremely ludicrous! And we surmise that every applauder of his atheism who does any thinking is conscious of this; every one sees that there is really no logic at all in this agnostic eloquence, but it is all feeling, and it is acceptable simply because it harmonizes with the conscious hatred of his hearers against the holiness of the Bible and its restraints on their proud self-will. We have only to remember that the object of every moral judgment is a moral object which unavoidably engages and interests the disposition, affections and will of every rational moral agent, and all who can reason see that no moral conclusion can be a pure intellection, but that some voluntary element must enter for good or for evil into the sources of every such judgment. No man on earth reasons towards objects which he either likes or dislikes strongly, with the same complete intellectual impartiality with which he reasons about pure mathematics. If he claims that he does, it is because "a deceived heart hath turned him aside." This is the analysis of common sense. This is the philosophy on which every sensible man in the world accounts for the multitude of these familiar facts, to-wit: that all people, while agreeing perfectly upon the truths of mathematics and numbers, differ more

or less upon questions of property rights, law-suits, character, politics, medicine, and religion. It is because all these objects of thought involve elements which appeal to the feelings and the will. Now the false argument itself concedes that where a voluntary element is involved in the sources of any spiritual action, it is to that extent responsible. This is all I claim. Here is a man who has reached true conclusions on moral subjects. He is virtuous and approvable for them just to the extent to which a right heart has co-operated in his reaching them. Here is another man who holds erroneous opinions on a moral subject, and he is responsible and blamable therefor just to the extent in which a proud and evil heart has helped to bring them about.

So absurd is Colonel Ingersoll's position that he clearly discloses the fact that he does not believe it himself. He claims not to be responsible or blamable for his anti-religious conclusions; then, of course, all the rest of us should be equally irresponsible for our conclusions held with similar honesty. Now here is a man whose thinking has honestly led him to this conclusion, which he really believes from the bottom of his heart he has fairly reached, to-wit: that Colonel Ingersoll's agnosticism is erroneous, that it is morally blamable, that he is consequently responsible for it (not indeed to man, but to his God, and this is the vital distinction which guarantees to all of us all the mental and religious liberty to which we are entitled), and consequently that the reproaches suggested by this evil creed which he hurls against his God, and his fatal misleading of his immortal fellow-men, are extremely sinful. Now, does Colonel Ingersoll view this honest conviction of mine with any of that philosophic nonchalance which he requires me to use towards his? Not he! He blames me for it extremely, as unjust to him, as tyrannical, tending towards the wickedness of persecution for opinion's sake. He fulminates his indignant rhetoric against the wrong I am doing him. He fills the atmosphere with his complaints of me. Now this excites our huge laughter. The unbeliever himself demonstrates the absurdity of his own position, and refuses to stand on it at the first change of the case. So he teaches us he does not believe his own philosophy.

It is in fact impossible to be believed by anybody, because

it involves us in absolute contradictions. If honesty in error were all that is needed to hold us innocent, truth would have no practical value above that of error. But truth has its eternal intrinsic value. Again, our decisive conclusions according to the necessary laws of our spirits direct us in our actions. It is proper that they should, or otherwise our actions might always be irrational, aimless, and worthless. Now if we allow the man to hold himself irresponsible for his moral opinions, of course we must hold him irresponsible for all the actions which they logically direct. After you have justified the tree in being the species of fruit-tree it is, you cannot blame it for bearing that species of fruit. So that this philosophy requires us to justify some of the most mischievous and abominable crimes that are done on earth. Let us see again whither it carries its advocate. Colonel Ingersoll knows that the slave-holders were generally sincere in their belief of their right; therefore he would have to justify the slavery he so abhors. He knows that Messrs. Davis, Lee and Jackson were perfectly sincere in their convictions; so he must justify them in all those blows at "the life of the nation" which his patriotism abhors. Supposing the magistrates of the old-fashioned State of Delaware, honest and sincere in the advocacy of that antiquated statute which, we are told, still makes atheistic utterances a misdemeanor punishable at the whipping-post, and supposing the gallant Colonel's zeal for his truth to have led him to that Pauline grade of heroism which makes men glory in stripes for the truth's sake, his philosophy would require him to justify those magistrates, even at the moment the constable's scourge was descending on his back. But would it? We trow not. Again he provokes the inextinguishable laughter of the on-lookers. His theory of free thought is "unworkable."

Again, the position leads to a consequence yet worse. It is entirely possible that two sincere reasoners may reach opposite conclusions concerning the same moral object. If each is irresponsible and innocent in his conclusion, he must be equally so in the action to which it directs him. So our philosopher has on his hands this strange case: A has a logical right to execute an action touching the disputed object, which B, the other party, has an equally logical and moral right to re-



sist as a wrong to himself! "The force of nature could no further go."

In conclusion of this head, we remind the "free-thinkers" (whom the above argument proves to be not free-thinkers, but crazy-thinkers), that their doctrine is refuted by every analogy of nature and every experimental fact of their own observation. The natural laws which regulate the results of our free actions invariably hold us responsible for our erroneous opinions. When we make honest mistakes as to the state of facts, nature makes no allowance for us, but inexorably holds us to the results of the real facts. The youth who goes sailing in a rotten boat, really supposing it to be sound, gets his ducking just the same. The farmer who exposes his grain, honestly thinking the fair weather will hold, if he proves mistaken in the weather, has his grain mildewed just as though he had wilfully neglected it. The sick man who swallows three grains of morphia, really supposing it to be quinine, dies just as the intentional suicide. But why multiply instances? We thus see universal nature repudiates this shallow philosophy. And so we return to our conclusion, that men are and ought to be responsible for their moral opinions; that the psychological reason why, is this: erroneous moral opinions cannot be adopted by the rational creature except there be some voluntary element at work amidst these sources of the wrong judgment; and to this voluntary element blame justly attaches; that, therefore, men are justly held responsible for their wrong actions, though logically dictated by their own opinions; that all penal responsibility for wrong opinions is reserved to God alone, and is never to be usurped by human beings unless those opinions be embodied in criminal actions; that the resistance of the errorist's fellow-men must be limited to disapprobation and argumentative refutation; and thus the truth is established without opening the door to the hateful doctrine of penal persecution for opinion's sake.

III. The third ground of objection, as given above, is his total denial of all punitive aspect and quality in the evil consequences of free human actions. He absolutely denies the element of rewards and punishments in the experienced course of human existence. He says that the evils which follow the mistakes of our free agency are nothing but natural consequences, following from the natural laws of the universe, which are

necessary and invariable; so that these experiences give no evidence whatever of a moral providence over men. Colonel Ingersoll roundly asserts that in the course of nature and experience there are no punishments, but only natural consequences. He also admits that the laws which dispense these consequences are invariable. The only possible method by which evil can be averted is to reform the mistakes which incurred it. The object of this strange doctrine is manifestly to escape that argument for the being and the moral providence of a God, which is written so plainly all over human events. We have two points here: First, his denial is abortive. Had he read, or read dispassionately, the second chapter of Part I. in Bishop Butler's Analogy, he would never have written those paragraphs in which he stated his doctrine. Bishop Butler shows by arguments which no man can refute, that the happy consequences of good conduct are of the nature of rewards, and evil consequences of misconduct have every trait and characteristic of true penalties, even down to the most minute; that this general law of nature is therefore a moral law as well as a natural one; that it is a disclosure of a righteous personal will above nature, and that it holds men under a moral probation for their conduct. And since this is universally true of man's moral estate, as soon as we learn his continued rational existence after death, the utmost probability arises, that we must meet the consequences of our probation in a future world as well as the present. All this follows without the light of Scripture. It is scarcely necessary to weary the reader by repeating the points of that masterly argument. It is a shame for any educated man, especially an English-speaking man, to handle this doctrine without informing himself of Bishop Butler's argument. No man who ever informs himself candidly of it will ever dispute its conclusions. I will, only for confirmation, make these two remarks: Every suffering transgressor in the world intuitively recognizes in his own consciousness the conceptions of guilt and punishment as soon as he recognizes the causal connection between his own error and the natural evil consequences. Let any such case be taken at random. Let it be, for instance, the case of a man who, by sensual excesses in the use of stimulants (alcohol, opium, tobacco), has ruined his digestion. His reason has admitted this proposition—that his own excesses have caused

his own sufferings. Has there ever been such a man in the world whose consciousness contained only the physical feelings of pain, nausea, lassitude, and so-forth, and the self-calculated personal feelings of fear, sorrow, and so-forth? Is this all that is in his consciousness? Never. There is always the additional element of self-blame. There is always self-reproach for having done what he *ought not*. The man knows intuitively that he has been guilty in the case, and not merely mistaken; and that these sufferings are penal, and not merely painful. Men not seldom incur severe physical sufferings in the magnanimous performance of duties, as, for instance, the faithful fireman who is burnt in rescuing human life. Now the burn hurts him just as badly as the drunkard's gastritis hurts him; but is it possible for the consciousness of these two men under the sufferings to be the same? Never. This brave, honest man suffers, but cannot reproach himself. This guilty sensualist also suffers, and is compelled to reproach himself. According to Colonel Ingersoll's theory, the two men ought to have the same consciousness. Such test-cases show that the human mind intuitively, and necessarily, recognizes those very moral elements of blameworthiness and punishment which are so rashly denied. My other remark is, that all men, when spectators of the natural penalties of transgression, intuitively recognize the penal relation. What they say is always something like this: "We are sorry for him, but it serves him right"; or, "Well, the fellow has got what he deserves." Now, what does the common sense of mankind mean by these words "right," "desert?" We thus see that the world is against that doctrine. Colonel Ingersoll is a lawyer. We would request him to attempt an explanation upon his philosophy of the penalties which civil society visits upon secular crimes. If there is any logic in his composition, a half-hour's meditation on that problem will convince him that his philosophy lands him in a Serbonian bog. For instance, would the conscience of mankind have universally justified such inflictions by civil society if it had not been instructed and supported by the analogy of these penalties of nature? Is not civil society itself one of the inevitable results of this constitution of human nature? Yes. Must it not follow, then, that the evils which civil society visits on secular crimes are also natural consequences of these natural laws, as truly so as the

drunkard's gastritis? But those are avowedly penal. Once more, Colonel Ingersoll on his theory would have to explain the imprisonment which he visits on a felon, as precisely parallel to the detention in a quarantine ship of a virtuous citizen who has just had the bad luck to sail recently from a yellow-fever port. Are the two inflictions precisely the same expediences for the public good, equally unfounded on an imputation of guilt to the sufferers? That is the explanation to which his philosophy would lead him; but he dare not accept it. He knows that the virtuous traveler is detained in spite of his innocence; but the felon is detained because of his guilt. He who says that the natural evils incurred by misconduct are not penalties, but mere consequences, ought also to say that evils which society, itself a natural institution, inflicts on criminals are also mere consequences, and not just penalties. But against this every conscience revolts.

Our second point of objection is: that Colonel Ingersoll's doctrine about natural evils, if true, would be unspeakably harsher and more repulsive than the Christian doctrine, which he thinks too harsh to be endured. For, first, it places us erring mortals not under the dominion of a righteous personal will, which is also wise, benevolent, and merciful, but under the rule of invariable natural laws. Under these, the evils which men experience, saith he, are not penalties, but mere consequences. Now a code which has no penalties of course has no pardons. There is no room in it for the conception of forgiveness. It tells a suffering transgressor that, when once his mistake is made, his suffering must be as inevitable as the attraction of gravitation or the rotation of the earth. Can mere natural law hear a prayer? Does it understand repentance? Can it feel pity? Ask the ocean storm or the devouring fire these questions. Here truly we have humanity with a vengeance! The skeptic is too humane to endure the conception of penal chastisement directed by a personal God, who is both just and merciful; and to help matters, he proposes to consign his fellow-creatures to the iron and remorseless dominion of natural law, which is equally ignorant of repentance, mercy, and forgiveness. But, he says, let the erring man reform his mistake, and thereby he will emerge from the painful consequences. Is this true? Does he not know that the constant tendency of natural

evil is to proceed to the irreparable stage? This drunkard's gastritis, for instance, even if he reforms early, is only palliated, not wholly eradicated. At best he goes the rest of his life a crippled man, and death, the supreme natural evil, falls upon him at last; but in a multitude of instances the gastritis retains its virulence in spite of the reform. For all these innumerable sufferers the skeptic has only a gospel of despair. He tells his fellow, "You are in the clutches of inexorable physical law; you have transgressed it; you perish."

Next, it is impossible for Colonel Ingersoll to rid either himself or his fellow-creatures of the sentiment of moral desert in their conduct. It is at once the deepest and the keenest of human sentiments. There is no craving of the human soul so profound as the demand for justice to its merits, and a righting for the wrongs done to it. There is no anguish so keen, so inconsolable, as that inflicted by their refusal. Now the skeptic's theory proposes to take these moral creatures, with these exquisite sensibilities, and subject them to a system of laws which neither knows nor cares anything about moral deserts. Which is about as humane as to consign the feeding, nursing, and consolation of all the orphan, the sick, and the sorrowing children in the world to a huge steam engine. For our part, we would rather leave our orphans to an all-wise parent, who would whip them well when they deserved it, but who could also hear their prayers, understand their penitence, and forgive their waywardness.

Once more, our skeptic confesses that he cannot tell us whether we shall live beyond bodily death or not. Then, for all he knows, we may. And if we do, it follows of course from his theory, that we must pass our immortal existence also under this blind natural code of laws, which, knowing nothing of penalties, can know nothing of pardons. When we observe the system of nature, as expounded by him, the clearest and most ominous feature about it is, that these evil consequences of human error are continually tending to pass, under our own eyes, into the irreparable. The longer the career of error is continued, the more certainly is this result reached. Thus the only inference from his scheme of naturalism is this, that if we should not have the luck to die like the pig or the dog, we must face the violent probability, that these "mere consequen-

ces" of human error will, in every case, become irreparable and eternal. And this is the sort of comfort gravely offered to his sinning and sorrowing fellow-men, by one who professes to be too humane and tender-hearted to endure the Christian system, with its divine equities, and divinely wrought grace and pardon, offered to the whole world without money and without price.

IV. But the chief ground of objection which seems to prevail with the modern impugnors of Christianity is the old one of God's permission of evil in his kingdom. It is as old as human literature, having been discussed by Job, by the Psalmist, by the Greek philosophers, by Seneca, and by a multitude of divines of subsequent ages. The theodicy, or vindication, of God from this cavil, makes a part of almost every book on natural theology, and has engaged the greatest intellects of the world—as a Leibnitz, a Chalmers. Of course I profess to advance nothing new. Neither is there need of doing it; for the recent school of cavillers advance nothing which has not been pondered and rejected a thousand times before. And they differ from the more thoughtful and decent skeptics of previous days only in the superficiality and insolence of their objections. But I will use in dealing with them a candor they do not employ in opposing us. I will state the difficulties which attend God's permission of evil frankly, and with all the force which even the ablest objector can claim for them.

The theistic scheme professes to demonstrate the existence, attributes, and providence of God. It says that he is self-existent and the creator of all temporal beings; that he is absolutely supreme in authority; that he is of infinite knowledge and power; that he is perfectly holy, and must therefore prefer holiness to sin in all rational creatures; and that he is infinitely benevolent as well as just. The argument is, that it is incredible such a divine sovereign should freely choose the prevalence of evil in the kingdom which he made and absolutely governs, and especially that dreadful aggregate of remediless evil embodied in his hell. But if he is incapable of freely choosing such horrors they should have no place in his kingdom; since his knowledge and prescience are infinite, and his will efficacious and sovereign in his whole providence. Amidst this circle of attributes, it is urged, it ought to be impossible that hell

should find a place, not to speak of the lesser evils of our mortal state. The Christian apologists have been wont to offer these palliations: That while all these are real evils, and so repugnant in themselves to the divine nature, we actually see them made in his providence the occasions of excellent results and beautiful virtues. Evil evokes the virtue of fortitude, which would be otherwise not energized. Evil trains the soul to patience, submission, and heavenly-mindedness. Suffering is necessary to evoke the lovely virtue of sympathy. Hence we may hold that a benevolent God permissively ordains the evil, not for its own sake, but for the sake of those results which it occasions. This palliation our opponents sweep aside with disdain. They say if your God is omnipotent, he is certainly able to work all these admirable results by painless means. If he is benevolent, as you say, he must have chosen the easy means instead of the bitter, because he would thus have realized the whole aggregate of good and virtue for his kingdom, minus the miseries of the present plan. They confirm this point by reminding the Christians that, according to them, there actually is a splendid order of moral creatures for whom God has done this very thing. The virtue and bliss of Gabriel are certainly not inferior to those promised redeemed men; for their prototype "was made a little lower than the angels." And the utmost the Christian's Jesus dares to promise is that his redeemed shall be as *angelloi*. Here, then, they urge, is a whole world of happy and holy creatures, endowed with every desirable virtue, including sympathy and fortitude, and yet without any discipline of evil. Here, then, God has actually done the thing for them without the permission of evil; why does he not do the same thing for human creatures in the same way? Thus the caviller "refuses to be comforted" by any such palliation as this. Let us pause here and weigh this reply carefully. To what extent does it really damage the theodicy advanced? I candidly admit, that it does prove this class of palliations to be insufficient as a full solution of the difficulty. But I assert that the skeptic's position here is overweening and sophistical in this: when he so ingeniously cites to us the fact that God does cultivate in the elect angels, as free agents, a complete bliss and purity without the discipline of evil, he cunningly begs the question, whether God could succeed in this,

not only without evil among them, but without evil anywhere in the universe. What mortal can certainly know but that one of the means which God found necessary in the training of the elect angels, was some wholesome example of suffering for sin among some other order of free agents? But unless the skeptic can certify us about this, his instance remains inconclusive. It is more important to remark, that the facts cited in the above theodicy do give us a pleasing probability, which points in the direction of God's consistency in the permission of evil. For the beautiful feature which is common in the results cited is that we here see providence bringing good out of the evil. That fact is undeniable. Does the skeptic rejoin, "Yes, but why didn't your God bring about the whole good, minus the evil?" I grant that this solemn question is not answered. But let it be allowed for a moment, and for argument's sake, that God may see a good reason, then the fact that he does bring good out of the permitted evil will be of invaluable force to reinstate our confidence in his infinite benevolence in the midst of the unsolved mystery.

We proceed now to the next advance in the argument of the theodicy. The theologians set up these unquestionable premises. There is no natural evil in the universe which is not the result and penalty of moral evil, that is to say, of sin. God's higher glory is to be a moral governor of rational free agents. If the creatures are to remain such they must be governed by moral inducements. Should God depart from that method he would derationalize them and reduce them to the grade of brutes. Does any skeptic desire to see that done, and the creation stripped of its noblest order? Surely not. It follows, then, that God, in leaving men their free agency, must follow out punctually this plan of moral sanctions; and if his creatures choose to sin, he must needs allow the penalty to follow with the same regularity with which his rewards follow their virtues. Moreover, God's distributive righteousness not only justifies, but requires this course from him as a moral ruler; as the chief magistrate of the universe he is actually under moral obligations to his own perfections to be impartial, even if wilful transgressors do incur deserved miseries which his benevolence would fain see them escape. And this view is powerfully reinforced by the further fact, that the larger part of the penal



evils that follow transgression have not only a judicial connection, but a necessary natural connection with their sins, that, namely, of effects with their efficient causes. There is a true sense in which it is not God that volunteers to punish sin, but it is sin which punishes itself. "He that soweth to his flesh *shall of the flesh* reap corruption" (literally *perdition*. "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." To sum up, then, God's permission of natural evil in the world is all accounted for by the presence of moral evil, that is to say, voluntary transgression, and the entrance of the moral evil is an incident liable to emerge under any moral government of free agents.

Still our 'skeptics "refuse to be comforted." They retort, that the Christian scheme ascribes to God regenerative power; and that it holds that he can, and does, exercise it in a multitude of cases, without infringing the free agency of its subjects, or making any disruption in his general plan of governing them by rational and moral means. If the Christian's scheme relinquished this claim it would commit logical suicide. For it holds that the natural heart of men fallen in Adam is invariably determined to self-will and ungodliness; hence if God did not exercise a sovereign power of regeneration, he could never get one of them converted. They would all continue with absolute certainty to prefer the unconverted state. The scheme also claims that God has pledged himself to keep all redeemed men and elect angels in their heaven forever. But the voluntary apostasy of any of them must result in their exclusion from heaven. Now, therefore, if God had not the power of efficaciously determining their holiness without subverting their free agency, he has promised what he cannot be sure of performing, which would be dishonest. Once more; the Christian scheme says, that the promises of grace in answer to prayer are all yea and amen. So that if God had not this power these promises would also be uncandid. Now, then, since God has this power of preserving the sanctity of the unfallen, and of sovereignly regenerating the fallen (a power which they say he frequently exercises), and if he foresaw that whenever a free agent perverted himself, his own high judicial obligations would require him to bring misery on that creature, if he is infinitely benevolent, and truly prefers holiness to sinfulness in his creatures, why did he not preserve them all in holiness as he is said to have preserved

Gabriel? Or why does he not regenerate them at once instead of coming under this painful necessity of employing penal miseries, which he foresees, moreover, to be futile for curing their sinfulness? Why does he not regenerate Satan instead of chastising him endlessly, and that without bettering him? Here is a parent who has a delicate child; he foresees that this child is liable to eat a certain rich but unwholesome viand with a morbid appetite; he foresees also that the consequences will be a colic. Now, this parent may be entirely unable to break the pathological connection between a surfeit and a colic; but of course he will use his superior physical strength to remove that dish beyond the child's reach. If God is a parent, why does he not act in a similar way? I take the ablest skeptics to witness that I have extenuated nothing, but have stated their difficulty as strongly as they ever state it.

There is here solemn difficulty arising from our contemplation of the divine providence, and the thoughtful and benevolent mind will recognize it most impressively. I expressly admit also that its exhaustive solution is beyond human reach. The dread mystery which remains after all the efforts of human explanation is doubtless one instance of the exercise of that high prerogative of God in which he claims that secret things belong to him, but the things which are revealed belong to us and our children that *we may do* all the words of this law. If once the existence and attributes of God are granted, then every mind not wickedly and insanely arrogant will instantly admit that it is reasonable such a sovereign should have counsels of his own, a part of which it is his just prerogative to reserve to himself. There is not an inferior chief magistrate on earth that does not claim a right to the same. Moreover, it is impossible that God should impart a full comprehension of his whole counsel to any mind that is finite and sinful, even if we supposed him to make the effort. Omnipotence itself could not put an ocean of water into a quart pitcher. But because God has not succeeded in working this impossibility in the agnostic's little clouded mind he flies off in a pet, and says he will not have any God at all! If theism is true, the plan of God's administration is universal and everlasting. It must, therefore, be literally infinite. Manifestly even he cannot put another mind in full possession of it without making that mind also infinite.

Whence it strictly follows that if these questioners could be gratified by giving them a religion without a mystery, verily they "should be as gods." (The Bible reader knows the satanic origin of that ambition.) This simple argument for modesty of thought in our theology is powerfully reinforced by another great fact, which is, that our acquaintance with all other sciences is conditioned and limited in precisely the same way. And every intelligent man knows that this is especially true of those physical sciences which the agnostics love to put in contrast with theology for superior clearness and certitude. I would like to know how it is that they are all perfectly willing to believe in the sciences of physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, astronomy, notwithstanding the insoluble mysteries involved in each, and refuse theism because of its mystery, when they ought to know that this is the very science in which the largest mysteries must reasonably be expected. Is it because they have a special dislike to the God whom theism discloses, sharpened by the apprehension that he has a just dislike for them? Let it be settled, then, that the real question in debate is not whether anybody can clear up the whole mystery of God's permission of evil, but whether that mystery justifies anybody in repudiating his heavenly Father, and all the duties he owes to him, which are the highest and holiest duties of his being.

Next, it must be settled which party is logically bound to assume the burden of proof on this question. I shall now show that it is the agnostic's. For why? Because the theist is in possession of all the rightful presumptive probabilities on the other side. The law gives every indicted man the right to assume his presumptive innocence, and throws the burden of the proof of his guilt upon the accuser. So here the facts previously demonstrated, or at least rendered presumably probable in this theistic inquiry, all give the theist the right to the initial presumptive. For instance, "the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord," that is, the *a posteriori* marks or signs of the divine benevolence appear in every department of creation and human experience. The whole structure of the human faculties presents the most beautiful evidences of the benevolence of "the Father of our spirits." Here is one point among many: The psychologist finds in the human spirit a class of affections called the malevolent affections, that is, their prac-

tical objective impulse is to hurt somebody; but they all have this invariable trait in addition—even the few among them which are sometimes justifiable—that they are also painful to the person that feels them. There is a large opposite class called the benevolent affections; their objective impulse is to do good to somebody, and these have this invariable trait, that they are pleasant in their exercise to the persons who feel them. He is wilfully blind who cannot see the design of this pair of general facts. It is obviously to discourage and limit all hurtful human actions, and to stimulate and reward all beneficent human actions. In other words, the framer of our spirits is benevolent. But the most extensive and grandest disclosure theism makes about God is of his righteousness, and that both in natural and revealed theology. The ways of providence are always so devised that virtue is practical beneficence, and vice practical maleficence. Therefore when theology tell us that God likes the former and hates the latter more than he likes or hates anything else, it is but saying he is supremely benevolent. But we must not pursue this delightful line of argument.

Another great class of facts which authorize us to throw the burden of proof upon the accusers of God's providence, is that while he mysteriously permits evils, it is his dearest prerogative to bring good out of those evils. Are we to hold, then, that God's mysterious permission of evil has in his mind some sufficient ground, both just and benevolent, though above the reach of human comprehension? I say, Yes. Colonel Ingersoll says, No. Here is the issue clearly made up by the pleadings. Now I say I am entitled to hold my side as presumptively true until it is positively disproved. I say the burden of proof lies on him. He must assume it or the court will properly dismiss the case. The court says to him: "Mr. Prosecutor, you undertake to prove that an infinite God cannot have a conscious ground for his voluntary permission of evil in his kingdom which satisfies him as both just and benevolent. You must do all that, sir, or we will put you out of court. Your opponent, the theist, is under no more obligation to prove what that ground is than a citizen indicted for horse-stealing is bound to prove affirmatively that he did not steal the horse. He is entitled to stand on the defensive; the prosecutor must prove that he did steal the horse or he has no case. Sir, your duty here is similar."

But what sort of testimony will this accuser need in order to prove that affirmative? Manifestly it must be a testimony which explores the whole extent of God's omniscience, and his whole eternal providence toward the universe; otherwise it will be a dead failure; for the defense will rejoin, that it is supposable always that God has seen his sufficient reason for his permission of evil in that portion of his infinite counsel and providence left unexplored by the witness. The accuser has as yet done nothing effectual to exclude the presumptive hypothesis that God may be justifiable; but this is what he undertook to do. He will say, perhaps, that his witnesses have proved so much namely: that God has full physical power to make and keep all his creatures holy and happy, so that he cannot justify himself in his permission of evil (as the Pelagian proposes he shall), by the plea of inability. Let the accuser say that God did not find the obstacle in the way of making his universe all holy and happy in a lack of personal power. Granted. But may not his infinite mind have seen a proper obstacle in some other quarter? That is the question. The man who undertakes to deny that ought to be omniscient himself. In other words, the accuser has undertaken an impossible task. He has rashly undertaken to establish affirmatively a proposition which none but infinite beings would be competent to discuss. The decree of the court therefore is, "The indictment is not proved."

To this extent, then, the providence of God is not convicted of wrong. I again admit candidly that its solemn mystery remains, and a questioning mind is not yet furnished with an exhaustive solution.

There is a species of *argumentum ad hominem*, which, the books on logic tell us, is unfair. It consists in attempting to transfer some odium attaching to the adversary from his person to his proposition and argument. I shall not use that form. There is another kind which consists in holding the opponent bound to any inconvenient or absurd consequences which proceed logically out of his positions, though we ourselves do not concede those positions. This kind is perfectly fair. The Saviour himself used it against the Pharisees. I am entitled to use it in this debate.

In this direction my first point is the following: The practical point of the cavil against God's permission of evil is, that,

if there is a God, he is culpable for it. He is exceedingly blamable for all this misery which should have been prevented by him. That is to say, the caviller is altogether in sympathy with these creature sufferers as against their hard master. Of course, then, this humane and sympathizing caviller is doing everything in his power to minimize the hardships so blamably inflicted upon his fellow-creatures. Of course he is steadily devoting his best energies, his time, talents, and money, to repairing the cruelties which this bad God has let loose upon poor fellow-mortals, to comforting the sorrowful, to supplying their destitutions, and especially to removing their ignorance and vices and irreligion, which he knows to be the practical proximate cause of so much of these pitiable sorrows. Of course this just accuser thinks he has no money to waste upon the pomps and luxuries of life, no time for any needless amusements, no time or talent to expend upon personal ambitions or any selfish aim. Of course he husbands all conscientiously for the sacred object of minimizing these evils of human existence, and mending so much as may be mended of the neglects of this cruel God. If he does not, is he not himself like the cruel God? Is not this accusation of God, coming from such as he, too much like "Satan reproving sin?" Does this agnostic waste any money upon Havana cigars and costly wines, which he would be better without; upon expensive architecture and furniture, where he sees more honored men than himself do with plainer; upon partisan political campaigns, which, whichever way they go, only leave the country more corrupt—sacred money which might have been used to ease the sick of their agonies, to feed the starving, to wipe the tears from the face of the orphan, to make the desolate widow's heart sing for joy, to dissipate the ignorance and vice and ungodliness from the heart of the youth who must otherwise reap the harvest of temporal perdition from these seeds? I bring no charge; but I submit that, unless the agnostic is truly acting in this philanthropic way, decency should close his mouth. For shame's sake let him not blame God for the results of a neglect which he himself practices.

The most probable rejoinder of the agnostic will be, that he sees the majority of the professed Christians also practicing this unphilanthropic neglect. My answer is, that I admit with sorrow that it is partly true. It is also true that nearly all the

great and blessed charities of this poor world come from these imperfect Christians. How much of them comes from agnostics? I do not know. But let that pass. My word to the agnostic is this: suppose we let this good exalted God alone, and turn all the blows of our criticisms on these inconsistent Christians. I say to the agnostic, with all my heart, "Lay it on them well; but let alone the heavenly Father whom they misrepresent."

My second point is this: When we showed in defense of the divine providence that, supposing free agents choose to sin, their suffering ought to follow, and must follow, because judicial fidelity requires it, and because sin *is* suffering; the reply of the agnostic was this: that if there is a God, he must have foreseen that, and he ought to have felt bound to protect his moral creatures from sinning by making their souls holy, or else regenerating them when they made themselves unholy. And we saw that this is really the agnostic's final stand in this contest. I will now ask a typical agnostic, say Colonel Ingersoll, "Sir, how would you like God to regenerate you?" Perhaps he will seek to evade me by answering, "But I do not now believe there is any God or regeneration." "Yes; but supposing you did believe them, how would you like to be regenerated yourself? Stay, do not answer till I tell you what this means. Regeneration means a complete revolution of the principles and ends of life. It means surrendering ambition and worldiness for spiritual good. It means the absolute subjugation of self-will under a superior and sovereign will, which will order you to obey and ask no questions. It means a thoroughgoing crucifixion of natural pride. It means the instant surrender of all cherished sins. It means the honest assumption for the whole remaining life of a career of new duties, many of which are known to be repugnant, and all arduous. It means praying, and Bible-reading, and watching one's self. It means, in a word, taking up for life the yoke of a complete self-denial and self-surrender. Regenerate persons will tell you that still they have found a new species of spiritual happiness in this arduous cross-bearing. But that pleasure is to you purely visionary, as you never felt anything like it. The Bible also tells you that this regeneration will finally bring you, after a severe discipline, the happiness of heaven. But that is all out of sight to you, lying beyond the boundaries of this world, which now en-

close all your wishes and aspirations—so completely enclose them that you remain in doubt whether it would not be better for you to die like a pig than to have any future world. Now, Sir, you told us there was a time when you had a speculative belief in God and his gospel. At that time how would you have liked this regeneration for yourself? You know very well that you disliked and resisted it with every fibre of your heart. Sometimes when conscience seemed to be leading you towards it, you recalcitrated, silently perhaps, but with the stubbornness of a wild bull in a net. You jealously cherished your self-will, your pride, your worldliness. You would have blushed to have been caught praying. One chief source of that secret but inveterate enmity which your heart cherished toward the gospel was just this: that it required of you such a regeneration and also offered it to you as a boon. Well, you are the same man yet in heart. The child has been father to the man. Could I re-convince your speculative intellect that this gospel which you have discarded is true, the desperate repugnance to its regeneration would doubtless revive in you. Remember, now, that we have agreed that there was one final method feasible for God, by using which he could have rescued all his creatures effectually from all moral and physical evil, namely, the regeneration I have described; and the very *gravamen* of your accusation against God is that he ought to employ that method in every case, but does not. But, lo! when this kind God comes to *you* and says, 'Ingersoll, let me take you at your word; let me regenerate you, here and now, and thus bestow on you this glorious and eternal security,' you are violently opposed to his doing it. Here is the one and only way which remained to God for avoiding the permission of any evil in his kingdom, and to this way you have as to yourself a violent objection. There is one medicine with which God could have cured the whole matter. You have been blaming him vehemently because he has not administered it to everybody; but when he offers the cup to you, you repel it with abhorrence. Do not you think, Sir, that for shame's sake it is time for you to stop blaming him?"

I have just asserted the innate enmity of the human heart to God's law. Here is a consideration which has a vital influence on this discussion, but for which agnostics never make allowance. Yet, "whether they will hear, or whether they will



forbear," it is the right of the Christian pursuing this discussion, and his high duty, to bear his serious testimony to this indisputable fact of human nature. The point it contains is very plain, that a person who has a fixed and wrongful hatred to a government cannot be a just and correct critic of it. What man endued with common sense will gainsay that? And the agnostics stubbornly refuse this caution and protest their impartiality, when to everybody else but themselves their inveterate hostility to the holiness of God's law is apparent! But I claim more. We are all voluntary culprits. We are all obnoxious to the displeasure of the divine Judge. If his grace does not arrest us we all continue pertinacious transgressors, and this justifies his continued retributions. Now, every item of that aggregate of misery which presents the pretext of the cavil, is the just judicial consequence of the creature's own voluntary sin. There is not a pang of natural evil in the moral universe which is not the appropriate fruit of transgression. Hence, however hard to bear that natural evil may be, the culprits are certainly not the parties that are entitled to accuse the government. As soon as they appreciate their own guilt they always learn that this is outrageously unseemly. If any criticism of the divine management is to be made by any finite intellect, it ought to be at least an unfallen intellect, without sin of its own. The effectual way, then, of terminating these indictments of God would be for the agnostics to learn the real quality and aggravations of their own sins of heart, nature, and life. And could I teach them this, I should be conferring on them the most inestimable blessing. Not only would this sinful debate end absolutely, but this righteous humiliation of their own spirits would prove to them the beginning of everlasting good. Job was tempted to be an agnostic, and to make tedious efforts to argue himself into the assertion of God's harshness. His effectual cure came only when he was compelled to say: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." The best wish I can offer to all the agnostics is, that they may become honest enough with themselves to look fairly at God until they appreciate his infinite sovereignty, wisdom, justice, and benevolence, and learn in the light of his holiness to see the exceeding sinfulness of their own sin. All this

debate will then be happily ended for them as well as for us.

One more point remains of this branch of my reply. I make it by asking them what will be gained for them and their fellow-men if they establish their indictment? What will they have proved? This: that the theistic scheme of the universe is incredible, because of the prevalence in it of this dreadful mass of natural and moral evil. That is, the doctrine of a personal, rational God is abolished. What hypothesis of the universe is left us? Only the materialistic and mechanical one. The flow of events in the universe is not directed by any personal or moral will at all. (Certainly our wills are impotent to control it.) All is governed by natural laws, which can mean nothing more than the irrevocable methods of blind natural forces. These forces are unknowing and reasonless; they are resistless; they are eternal; they are unchangeable. They can no more be prayed to than the whirlwind can. Thus the agnostic, in rejecting theism, unavoidably gives us the scheme of a universal mechanical fate. His universe is but an immense machine.

Now, I solemnly ask him: By forcing upon us this ghastly doctrine, has he diminished one iota of this volume of miseries, the conception of which so distresses us all? Does he stop the flow of a single tear? Does he arrest a single pang of disease? Does he diminish by one unit the awful catalogue of deaths? Does he take anything from the reality of any single human bereavement? Is there one particle of agency in this doctrine to check in any soul that sinfulness which is the spring of all our woes? None. Even agnostic arrogance does not dare to claim it. On his scheme every evil which he so bitterly objects against God's scheme remains. All that he has done is to rob suffering humanity of its sole true consolation, which is found in that fact the gospel alone shows us, that it is the darling prerogative of the Father of mercies to bring good out of this sore evil for all who will accept his grace and make it work out, bitter as it may be now, "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Thus their doctrine can take nothing from the miseries of mankind; all it can do is to rob men of the only possible solace, and to tell them while they suffer that their woes are as futile of better results as they are inevitable. In a word, they give us as the true conception of our existence this somber picture, which F. D. Strauss substantially avows at the

end of his great agnostic argument. Our world is a huge and terrible machine of stone and iron; its motive power eternal, resistless, and blind; its revolutions impossible to be ever arrested or changed in the least, and the corn between its upper and nether millstones is an ever-flowing stream of human hearts, with all their precious affections and hopes and keen sensibilities, bleeding and crushed under the remorseless grind. And to the yawning jaws of this hellish mill each one of us knows he is traveling, and must be caught by them sooner or later.

And this is the scheme pressed upon us by gentlemen who affect too much humane sensibility to endure the harsh injustice of God's gospel! What, is this scheme rejected for this doctrine of despair? I repeat, it is the one which, while it recognizes God's holy sovereignty and right to punish sin, and to keep in his own breast the dread secrets of his infinite purpose, teaches us his wise, merciful, and holy control over this terrible blind machine of nature, and offers to all who do not contumaciously reject his goodness an almighty redemption which terminates these sufferings of time into eternal blessings. May God save us all from such humanity as that of the agnostics!

Proceeding now to a more independent line of attack, I request the reader to inspect the process of the agnostic's logic at its cardinal place. It is simply this: the line of argument for the being, attributes, and providence of God leads him up to a great mystery, which cannot be fully resolved for him. What then? He will stop and weigh the amount of validity it may contain, notwithstanding the mystery in its conclusion. Now, all men would deem this mere logical lunacy if applied to any other line of evidence. We know very well that evidence apparently valid which leads to an inevitable self-contradiction is defeated by its own result, whether we can put our finger upon its flaw or not. We justly claim that it cannot be correct. This, in fact, is the quality of the disproof of an argument by the *reductio ad absurdum*. But manifestly the case which the agnostic has made against theism is wholly different. A mystery in our conclusion is not a necessary self-contradiction; that it cannot be shown to be such, follows from the very fact that it is a mystery. Since we cannot comprehend it, we cannot assert its contradictoriness. And this I confirm by the assertion that ev-

ery other line of scientific evidence, in every department of human knowledge, leads sooner or later to some such insoluble mystery. So that, if the agnostic's method of procedure against theism were proper, he ought to reject every science known to man and announce himself an absolute ignoramus.

For instance, what physicist can answer this question: What is electricity? There is good and sufficient empirical evidence that this mysterious energy exists; but what is it? Why does it imbue some material bodies and not others? Why do only a few conduct it fully? If it is ponderable matter, why cannot the chemist weigh it in his most delicate scales? If it is not, how does it hit hard enough to rive the gnarled oak? Every good physicist knows he cannot answer these questions. Every agnostic, then, ought to say, if he will be consistent, and proceed in physics as he does in theology, "I will have none of this science of electricity. I will not avail myself of its conveniences, lightning-rod, telegraph, electric light, electric motors. I will not believe in electricity; even if the lightning strikes me I will not believe in it." The intelligent reader knows that if I cared to detain him, I could cite instances equally pungent from every one of those physical sciences which agnostics love to place in contrast with theology for their superior clearness. Now my point is, that no man can proceed upon this wilful method, which the agnostics would have us apply to the theistic argument, without incurring the charge of lunacy. But they ought to be more willing to apply that wanton method in physics than in theology; because in the latter we have more ground to expect mysteries from the infinitude of the Being whom we study. When a line of evidence leads a sensible man to a startling and mysterious conclusion, what does he do? He would be prompted to revise the evidence carefully. That is all. If he finds it valid, he admits the conclusion in spite of the mystery. The sensible man bestows credence upon any proposition in any science, not because he comprehends the predicate, but because he apprehends perspicuous evidence supporting the copula. Now the several lines of evidence, rational and scriptural, for the being, attributes, and providence of God, are of invincible force; they cannot be resisted in their own appropriate spheres. Every successive attempt to weaken them in that way perishes under the light of true philosophy. I con-

clude this point by firmly asserting that agnostics have no right thus to discount the whole force of this evidence, treating it as non-existent, when it has so substantial an existence, not because they can refute it, but simply because they do not like its result. The process is utterly illicit.

Superficial opponents of God's retributive justice frequently argue that this is a different attribute from his love, and indeed so antithetic that they cannot find a place for it in a nature declared to be infinite love. A little correct thinking will show that this reasoning is not only groundless, but absurd. In fact, the principle of righteousness in every moral being is not dual, but single. The plurality of its actions arises solely from the contrast of the objects to which the principle directs itself. The magnetic needle in the compass is endued with one energy or magnetic principle, not two. This single energy will cause either end of the needle to act in opposite ways to the two opposite poles of the earth; and because the upper end is attracted towards the north pole, for that very reason it is repelled from the south pole. I prove it by this fact, that it is impossible to make a needle such that its upper end would be attracted to the north pole and not repelled from the south pole. Should any sailor tell you that he had such a needle, nobody would believe him. This instance presents us with a correct parallel to the action of the moral principle in a moral agent. The principle is and can be only one. It acts in opposite ways towards virtuous and vicious objects, because it is one, and because it rationally apprehends the objects as opposites. Hence it follows, that this central principle would not be capable of acting in the amiable way of approbation, complacency and reward towards a virtuous object, unless it were certain from its own nature to act in the opposite and severer way of reprehension towards a vicious and repulsive object. I repeat, that unless this principle is so constituted as to repel the repulsive action, it cannot be so constituted as to be attracted to the attractive action. One might as well talk of a yard-stick with only one end, or of a house with its south side, and no north side. Every man when he thinks knows that this is the condition upon which all correct moral principle exists, and he is incredulous about any other. Let me construct a little parable. I ask the agnostic, or the universalist, to come with me

and watch the proceedings of a certain stranger, of whom all we know as yet is that he claims a high reputation for amiability, philanthropy, equity and charity. He tells us that it is a perennial pleasure to him to witness and reward all benevolent and generous actions. I say to him, "Stranger, so far, well. I must now point you an opposite object. There stands a young reprobate, the son of a devoted widowed mother, who is known to have robbed her of her little property, to neglect her wants in her destitution, to heap reproaches and curses upon her, and even to strike her venerable face. What are your feelings towards that object?" We suppose the stranger to answer, "Oh, sir, I assure you I am too thoroughly amiable to have any feeling about it. True, I see nothing in it to admire, but I am too affectionate to detest anything. I have no feeling at all towards that reprobate." I ask, would anybody believe him? Or, if we believe his statement that he felt no reprehension for so detestable a son, must we not set him down also as a cold-blooded villain, whose pretended charity was all sheer hypocrisy? Such is the judgment of every man's common sense.

Let us pass now from the virtuous principle in man to God. I assert that my argument only becomes the stronger. The perfectness of God's virtues only renders it more conclusive, because the purity, the equity, the truth, the love of God are infinite. It is therefore only the more certain that the central principle which makes him approve and love the virtuous must prompt him to reprehend the vicious. Men vainly imagine that it would be a delightful theology to have a God so amiable as to be sure to reward all good things, but also too amiable to be capable of punishing any evil thing. They demand an impossibility. The only way to reach it would be to have a God without any moral qualities at all. Who would wish to live under an omniscient and omnipotent Ruler who was not capable of knowing or caring whether he was rewarding the wicked and punishing the good? If we must desire such moral principle in our Supreme Ruler as will be always certain of acting amiably and justly towards the good, then we must be willing that he shall be equally certain to reprehend the wicked. If they would have a God too amiable to maintain a hell, they must accept one who is also too careless and heartless to provide any heaven.

Does one say that still the mystery of God's permission of evil is not fully explained? I did not promise to explain it fully, which I believe will never be done in this world. What I promised was to satisfy the just and humble mind that God has his sufficient explanation, which we are sure is consistent with his wisdom, benevolence, and holiness, without knowing what it is. Natural theology gives sufficient ground for this consoling conclusion from its splendid evidences that he is all-wise, righteous, and benevolent, which have their preponderating force notwithstanding the unanswered question, and especially from this important trait, which runs through the whole mystery, that the plan of his providence is to bring good out of the evil.

But revealed theology gives us a crowning and all-sufficient satisfaction. It is found in the fact that God is so infinite in benevolence and mercy, that at his own mere option he has made the supreme sacrifice for the redemption of his enemies. He provides this infinite blessing for them at the cost of the humiliation and death of his eternally begotten and co-equal Son, whom he knows to outrank, in the dimensions of his infinite being and in his moral desert, all his rational creatures combined together. The gospel tells us that this transcendent sacrifice will not redeem the apostate angels, and will not receive full application to all human beings. These are awful truths. But, be the cause of this limitation found where it may, it cannot be sought in any lack or stint of goodness in God. For had there been any such stint in his nature, one fibre of neglect, or injustice, or cruelty, this would inevitably have prevented the supreme sacrifice for the behoof of any one. There is the triumphant theodicy in the infinite love which prompted redemption—redemption as apprehended by the evangelical trinitarian. There, no doubt, is the supreme glory of this gospel by which the apostle tells us God is making known to all worlds his manifold wisdom through the church of ransomed men. I will set forth the point of this argument in a closing parable. We see a surgeon enter a dwelling. A mother calls to her pallid, limping child, and seizes her in her arms. The surgeon produces one of those treacherous cases—so beautiful without with their ornamented woods and gilded clasps, so terrible within with the cold glitter of

forceps, bistouries, amputating-knives, and bone-saws. The child beholds with wide-eyed wonder and then with terror, ere she perceives that these instruments are to be employed on her body. As the surgeon approaches she appeals to her mother with agonizing screams and tears: "Oh, mother, mother, save me!" But we see the woman, with stern eye, compressed lips, and pallid cheek, bare the child's swollen joint, and hold her struggling in her relentless arms, while the cruel knife cuts the tender skin, carves the bleeding flesh, and pierces even to the very marrow of the diseased joint. Is this a mother or a tigress? The simple explanation is, that she is a true mother, wise and tender, who knows that this severe remedy is needed to save the precious life of her child, who would otherwise be the victim of a slow, loathsome, and torturing death. Has she not shown the truest love? and has not her fidelity cost her inward pangs of sympathy more cruel than the bodily smart of the surgery, which she has heroically borne for love's sake? But now steps forward the caviller, and says: "Stop, this woman is herself a wondrous leech. She knows all healing lotions, and all the herbs of virtue, some of which would have cured the diseased limb without a pang while the child slept; or, at least, she could have secured for her child the unconsciousness which chloroform gives during the operation. Why, then, did she not use the gentler means to save this life, when she had them at her option? No, she must be intrinsically cruel and heartless. She must find pleasure in the gratuitous suffering of her own child." I am compelled to reply: "I do not know her reasons. Her social station is far above mine. She has never taken me into her domestic confidence. I had no right to demand that she should. But I can testify to another fact. A few months ago the cry of fire drew me to a dwelling not far from this place which was wrapped in flames, and evidently near the final crash. The parents had been busy rescuing their children, and, for the moment, supposed they had saved them all. But a cry issued from another window. A little white-robed figure was seen at it through the eddying smoke, crying: 'Father, mother! O save me.' All declared that it was too late. Even the father, amidst his bitter tears, acquiesced. But I saw the mother tear herself from the restraining hands of the firemen, who told her that any effort at rescue was mad-



ness and suicide, leaving the shreds of her raiment in their clutches, and dart up the fuming stairway. The stern men turned their faces away from the horror and stood wringing their hands. But in a minute the woman returned, her silken tresses blazing, her garments on fire, one of her fair cheeks scorched, shrivelled by the blast, one eye blistered in the socket, but with her child in her arms wrapped safely in a blanket. After only pausing to extinguish the flames that were threatening her life, I saw her fall on her knees, and say: 'Thank God; I have saved my child.' Pass around this lady's chair, Mr. Caviller, you will see upon the other side of her face the scars of that rescue which, in one moment, blighted the beauty of her young motherhood for life. This is that mother; and this is the same child. Now, sir, I cannot satisfy your curiosity about the disuse of the chloroform, but I know this heroic mother's heart has its reason. For why? Because I saw her make the supreme sacrifice for this child. After such a demonstration of boundless love, your cavil is impertinent, if not brutal."

## THE ATTRACTIONS OF POPERY.<sup>1</sup>

---

Dr. John H. Rice, with the intuition of a great mind, warned Presbyterians against a renewed prevalence of popery in our Protestant land. This was when it was so insignificant among us as to be almost unnoticed. Many were surprised at his prophecy, and not a few mocked; but time has fulfilled it. Our leaders from 1830 to 1860 understood well the causes of this danger. They were diligent to inform and prepare the minds of their people against it. Hence General Assemblies and Synods appointed annual sermons upon popery, and our teachers did their best to arouse the minds of the people. Now, all this has mainly passed away, and we are relaxing our resistance against the dreaded foe just in proportion as he grows more formidable. It has become the fashion to condemn controversy and to affect the widest charity for this and all other foes of Christ and of souls. High Presbyterian authority even is quoted as saying, that henceforth our concern with Romanism should be chiefly irenical! The figures presented by the census of 1890 are construed in opposite ways. This gives the papists more than fourteen millions of adherents in the United States, where ninety years ago there were but a few thousands. Such Protestant journals as think it their interest to play sycophants to public opinion try to persuade us that these figures are very consoling; because, if Rome had kept all the natural increase of her immigrations the numbers would have been larger. But Rome points to them with insolent triumph as prognostics of an assured victory over Protestantism on this continent. Which will prove correct?

Both logic and Holy Writ teach us that "the thing which hath been is the thing which shall be." Like causes must be expected to produce like effects. For Presbyterians of all others to discount the perpetual danger from Romanism is thoroughly thoughtless and rash. We believe that the Christianity

left by the apostles to the primitive church was essentially what we now call Presbyterian and Protestant. Prelacy and popery speedily began to work in the bosom of that community and steadily wrought its corruption and almost its total extirpation. Why should not the same cause tend to work the same result again? Are we truer or wiser Presbyterians than those trained by the apostles? Have the enemies of truth become less skillful and dangerous by gaining the experience of centuries? The popish system of ritual and doctrine was a gradual growth, which, modifying true Christianity, first perverted and then extinguished it. Its destructive power has resulted from this: that it has not been the invention of any one cunning and hostile mind, but a gradual growth, modified by hundreds or thousands of its cultivators, who were the most acute, learned, selfish, and anti-Christian spirits of their generations, perpetually retouched and adapted to every weakness and every attribute of depraved human nature, until it became the most skillful and pernicious system of error which the world has ever known. As it has adjusted itself to every superstition, every sense of guilt, every foible and craving of the depraved human heart, so it has travestied with consummate skill every active principle of the gospel. It is doubtless the *ne plus ultra* of religious delusion, the final and highest result of perverted human faculty guided by the sagacity of the great enemy.

This system has nearly conquered Christendom once. He who does not see that it is capable of conquering it again is blind to the simplest laws of thought. One may ask, Does it not retain sundry of the cardinal doctrines of the gospel, monotheism, the trinity, the hypostatic union, Christ's sacrifice, the sacraments, the resurrection, the judgment, immortality? Yes; in form it retains them, and this because of its supreme cunning. It retains them while so wresting and enervating as to rob them mainly of their sanctifying power, because it designs to spread its snares for all sorts of minds of every grade of opinion. The grand architect was too cunning to make it, like his earlier essays, mere atheism, or mere fetishism, or mere polytheism, or mere pagan idolatry; for in these forms the trap only ensnared the coarser and more ignorant natures. He has now perfected it and baited it for all types of humanity, the most refined as well as the most imbruted.

I. Romanism now enjoys in our country certain important advantages, which I may style legitimate, in this sense, that our decadent, half-corrupted Protestantism bestows these advantages upon our enemy, so that Rome, in employing them, only uses what we ourselves give her. In other words, there are plain points upon which Rome claims a favorable comparison as against Protestantism; and her claim is correct, in that the latter is blindly and criminally betraying her own interests and duties.

(1.) A hundred years ago French atheism gave the world the Jacobin theory of political rights. The Bible had been teaching mankind for three thousand years the great doctrine of men's moral equality before the universal Father, the great basis of all free, just, and truly republican forms of civil society. Atheism now travestied this true doctrine by her mortal heresy of the absolute equality of men, asserting that every human being is naturally and inalienably entitled to every right, power, and prerogative in civil society which is allowed to any man or any class. The Bible taught a liberty which consists in each man's unhindered privilege of having and doing just those things, and no others, to which he is rationally and morally entitled. Jacobinism taught the liberty of license—every man's natural right to indulge his own absolute will; and it set up this fiendish caricature as the object of sacred worship for mankind. Now, democratic Protestantism in these United States has become so ignorant, so superficial and wilful, that it confounds the true republicanism with this deadly heresy of Jacobinism. It has ceased to know a difference. Hence, when the atheistic doctrine begins to bear its natural fruits of license, insubordination, communism, and anarchy, this bastard democratic Protestantism does not know how to rebuke them. It has recognized the parents; how can it consistently condemn the children? Now, then, Rome proposes herself as the stable advocate of obedience, order, and permanent authority throughout the ages. She shows her practical power to govern men, as she says, through their consciences (truth would say, through their superstitions). Do we wonder that good citizens, beginning to stand aghast at these elements of confusion and ruin, the spawn of Jacobinism, which a Jacobinized Protestantism cannot control, should look around for some moral and reli-

gious system capable of supporting a firm social order? Need we be surprised that when Rome steps forward, saying, "I have been through the centuries the upholder of order," rational men should be inclined to give her their hand? This high advantage a misguided Protestantism is now giving to its great adversary.

(2.) The Reformation was an assertion of liberty of thought. It asserted for all mankind, and secured for the Protestant nations, each man's right to think and decide for himself upon his religious creed and his duty towards his God, in the fear of God and the truth, *unhindered by human power, political or ecclesiastical*. Here, again, a part of our Protestantism perverted the precious truth until the "manna bred worms, and stank." Rationalistic and skeptical Protestantism now claims, instead of that righteous liberty, license to dogmatize at the bidding of every caprice, every impulse of vanity, every false philosophy, without any responsibility to either truth or moral obligation. The result has been a diversity and confusion of pretended creeds and theologies among nominal Protestants, which perplexes and frightens sincere, but timid, minds. Everything seems to them afloat upon this turbulent sea of licentious debate. They are fatigued and alarmed; they see no end of uncertainties. They look around anxiously for some safe and fixed foundation of credence. Rome comes forward and says to them, You see, then, that this Protestant liberty of thought is fatal license; the Protestant's "rational religion" turns out to be but poisonous *rationalism*, infidelity wearing the mask of faith. Holy Mother Church offers you the foundation of her infallibility, guaranteed by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. She shows you that faith must ground itself in implicit submission, and not in human inquiry. She pledges herself for the safety of your soul if you simply submit; come, then, "trust and be at rest." Many are the weary souls who accept her invitations; and these not only the weak and cowardly, but sometimes the brilliant and gifted, like a Cardinal Newman. For this result a perverted Protestantism is responsible. If all nominal Protestants were as honest in their exercise of mental liberty as the fear of God and the loyalty to truth should make them; if they were as humble and honest in construing and obeying God's word in his Bible, as papists profess to be in submitting to the authority of the Holy Mother Church, honest inquirers would

never be embarrassed, and would never be befooled into supposing that the words of a pope could furnish a more comfortable foundation for faith than the word of God.

(3.) To the shame of our damaged Protestantism, popery remains, in some essential respects, more faithful to God's truth than its rival. For instance, while multitudes of scholars, calling themselves Protestant Christians, are undermining the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures, Rome holds fast to it in her catechisms and formal declarations. True, she claims inspiration for others than the prophets, evangelists, and apostles for her popes, namely, and prelates, holding to "the apostolic succession." But if one must err, it is better to err by excess than by defect on a point like this, where negation cuts the blinded soul of man off absolutely from the divine guidance. Thousands of pretended Protestant believers are advancing their destructive criticism to assert that the Pentateuch is a literary fraud. Rome firmly maintains that it is God's own work through Moses. A thousand deceitful arts are plied to degrade the conception of inspiration, as giving only thoughts, and not the words, or as consisting only in an elevation of the consciousness by poetic genius, and such like treacherous views. Rome still teaches the old-fashioned, honest view. What right have such deceitful Protestants to scold Rome for dishonesty of those historical and spiritual impostures upon which she founds the claims of the popes? Truly, they are dirty enough; for the forged decretals, for instance, too much contempt and reprehension cannot be expressed. But they are not a whit dirtier than the mental dishonesty of the men who, after asserting that they have proved the Pentateuch mostly a literary fraud, done by priestcraft more than a thousand years after its pretended date, still assure us that its value as Scripture and divine rule of faith is not wounded. These recent justifiers of pious fraud cannot convict the older ones. The old imposture, like a rotten roof, has become moss-grown with age, and is picturesque and venerable in many eyes. The new imposture stands ugly and malodorous in its rank freshness.

Again, multitudes of pretended Protestants utterly deny the trinity, the very corner-stone of a theology of redemption. Rome affirms it in all the fullness of the creeds of Nice, Chalcedon, and Athanasius. Myriads of pretended Protestants revere their own ethical philosophy so much more than they do their

God that they must needs utterly reject Christ's vicarious satisfaction for the guilt of sin. Rome continues to assert it, in spite of spurious philosophy, although she does add to it superstitious claims of human merit. Myriads of our men have become such "advanced thinkers" that they cannot away with supernatural regeneration. Rome teaches it invariably, even if it is in the form of baptismal regeneration, and still ascribes it to the power of God. Such are a few of the biting contrasts. We cannot wonder that many, even of honest and reverent minds, when they witness this ruthless destruction of the essentials of the gospel, draw two plain inferences. One is, that all such men pretending to be Protestant believers are, in fact, nothing but infidels wearing a mask, probably for the sake of the loaves and fishes as yet connected with the clerical calling; so that it is mere impudence for such men to assume to warn them against popish impostures—rather too near akin to Satan reproving sin. The other is, that the Romanist theologians must have been right in asserting, ever since the days of Luther, that our Protestant way of establishing a divine rule of faith by a rational and explicit credence must turn out nothing but rationalistic infidelity. Souls which value a divine redemption for man shudder as they behold this wild havoc of everything characteristic of a saving gospel; and they naturally exclaim, "There is no security except in going back to that old foundation, implicit trust in the witness of 'Holy Mother Church' to the Scriptures!" Now, true Protestants know that this conclusion is wretchedly sophistical, but it is dreadfully natural for honest, half-informed men.

(4.) The best argument for any creed is the godly living of its professors. Protestantism used to have a grand and victorious advantage on that point. She is ceasing to wield it. The wealth begotten by her very virtues of industry, thrift, and probity has debauched many of her children. "Jeshurun has waxen fat, and kicked." An unbounded flood of luxury sweeps Protestant families away. A relaxed and deceitful doctrine produces its sure fruits of relaxed and degraded morals. Church discipline is nearly extinct. Meantime spurious revivalism, relying upon all species of vulgar clap-trap and sensational artifice, upon slang rhetoric and the stimulating of mere animal sympathies, instead of the pure word and spirit of God, is hur-

rying tens of thousands of dead souls into the Protestant churches. These evils have gone so far that a profession of faith in these churches has come to mean nearly as little as a professed conformity to Rome means. No shrewd man regards such a profession as any sufficient guarantee for truth or common honesty in dealing. The lawyers tell us that litigation unmasks about as much intended fraud, purposed extortion, and loose swearing in these church members as in other people. Worldly conformity is so general that the line between the church and the world has become nearly as indistinct as that between spiritual and profane living in the Romish communion. Meantime, Rome gets up no spurious revivals; she works her system with the steadiness and perseverance which used to characterize pastoral effort and family religion among Presbyterians. It is true that her cultus is intensely ritualistic; but, at least, it does not offend decent people by irreverent slang; her worship is liturgical, but her liturgies, however erroneous in doctrine, are, at least, genteel, and marked by aesthetic dignity. Rome does not venture on sham miracles very much in these United States. It is true she has her spurious relics and other superstitious impostures for impressing the people; but wherein are they less of human artifices and less deceptive than the machinery of our pretended revivals, with their marchings, hand-shakings, choruses, and ephemeral conversions? Rome's confessional is, indeed, a terrible organ of spiritual tyranny; but still it is a strong organ of church discipline, and it is steadily employed as such in every Romish chapel. The average Protestant church member feels that any assumption of real presbyterial authority over him by his pastor would be an impertinence, which he would resent with scorn. The Romish priest still wields a potent, ghostly authority over his people. One may cry that he wields it by virtue of superstition, by the threat of withholding his absolution or extreme unction. Yet he wields it, and usually for the credit of his church. He teaches his members to practice the forms of their daily devotion with diligence and regularity, holding out a powerful motive in the promise of merit thus wrought out. The Protestant may exclaim, These are but machine prayers, vain repetitions told off by the dozen along with the beads! Very true, the most of it may be very poor stuff; but nothing can be quite



so poor and worthless as the living of many Protestant members, who have no family altar and no closet, who say no prayers either in form or in spirit, and who have no conscience of keeping either Sabbaths or saints' days. It is a very bad thing in the Romanist to join the worship of Mary and the saints with that of God; but we surmise that it is a still worse thing to be a practical atheist, and statedly to worship nothing, neither saint nor God, as many an enrolled member of a Protestant church now does.

The Romanist's machine prayers and vain repetitions have, at least, this tendency, to sustain in his soul some slight habit of religious reverence, and this is better than mere license of life. While the two communions wear these aspects, we need not wonder that those Americans, at least, whose early prejudices lean towards Rome should honestly regard her as the better mother of piety and morals.

(5.) We Protestants are also giving away to Rome another powerful influence over honest and thoughtful Christian minds. This we do by secularizing our whole State education. The bulk of the Protestants in the United States have betrayed themselves, through their partisan political zeal, to an attitude concerning the rearing of youth which must ever be preposterous and untenable for sincere Christians. The statesmen and divines of the Reformation, the Luthers, Calvins, Knoxes, Winthrops, and Mathers, were strong advocates of State education; they were such because they believed in the close union of church and State; because their conception of the State was thoroughly theocratic. Had these men been asked, What think you of a theory of education which should train the understanding without instructing the religious conscience; which should teach young immortal spirits anything and everything except God; which should thus secularize education, a function essentially spiritual, and should take this parental task from the fathers and mothers, on whom God imposed it, to confer it on the human and earthly organism, expressly secular and godless? they would have answered with one voice, It is pagan, utterly damnable. But they thought that the State might educate, because the State with them was Christian. Thus State education was firmly grafted into the Puritan colonies. New England, with her usual aggressiveness, has pushed her usage

all over the empire. Meantime the Jeffersonian doctrine of the absolute severance and independence of church and State, of the entire secularity of the State, and the absolutely equal rights, before the law, of religious truth and error, of paganism, atheism, and Christianity, has also established itself in all the States; and still the politicians, for, electioneering ends, propagate this State education everywhere. By this curious circuit "Christian America" has gotten herself upon this thoroughly pagan ground; forcing the education of responsible, moral, and immortal beings, of which religion must ever be the essence, into the hands of a gigantic human agency, which resolves that it cannot and will not be religious at all. Surely some great religious body will arise in America to lift its Christian protest against this monstrous result! But, lo! the chief, the only organized protest heard in America comes from the Romish Church. It is she who stands forth pre-eminent, almost single-handed, to assert the sacred rights of Christian parents in the training of the souls they have begotten, of Christ in the nurture of the souls he died to redeem. To-day it is this Romish Church which stands forth precisely in the position of the Luthers, Calvins, Knoxes, and Mathers as to the main, central point, which is, *that the education of the young should be Christian, and should be committed to Christian hands.* And what are our representative Protestants saying? Instead of admitting this truth of the ages, and confessing the fatal error into which their haste and Jacobinism have betrayed them, they are only shouting that Rome objects to the American State school because Rome hates republicanism, and wishes to overthrow it. The best they can do is to place themselves in this absurd and dishonest position: To boast in one breath of their loyalty to the principles of the Reformers concerning education, and in the next breath to vilify the Roman Church for reasserting the very principles of these same Reformers. What can they expect save a miserable defeat upon this false position, if, indeed, common justice and common sense are to continue traits of the American mind; unless, indeed, America is to make up her mind to be atheistic or pagan instead of Christian? These misguided Protestants may be assured that there are hundreds of thousands of serious, devout parents who will be much more likely to honor Rome as the faithful champion of

Christ's rights over their children than to condemn her as the designing enemy of free government. In this unnatural contest Protestantism can only lose, while Rome gains; and she will gain the approval not only of the superstitious, but of the most thoughtful and devout minds.

(6.) It is with this most valuable class of minds that Rome is now gaining another far-reaching advantage. This is by her doctrine concerning marriage and the relations of the sexes. On these points she continues to hold and teach the highest views. It is very true that Rome errs in making marriage a sacrament of the church; but she makes it, as Scripture does, a divinely appointed and religious institution, while Protestant laws and debauched Protestant thought tend all over America to degrade it to a mere civil contract. The Roman doctrine and canon law recognize no divorce except by the pope himself. They teach that marriage is inviolable. The divorce laws in our Protestant States provide so many ways for rending the marriage tie that its vows have become almost a farce. We are told that many Protestant women in America scornfully refuse to take the vow of obedience to their husbands, appointed by God in his word; and Protestant parsons are so cowardly that they dare not mention it in the marriage ceremony. But Rome still exacts this conjugal obedience of her daughters. Romish pastors also stand almost alone in teaching their people the enormous criminality of those nameless sins against posterity at which fashionable Protestantism connives. Moral and thoughtful men who know history know how fundamental the sanctity of marriage and the family is to society and the church, how surely their corruption must destroy both and barbarize mankind, look on aghast at this spreading taint in American life. Many an educated patriot is beginning to say that Romanism is the only firm and consistent opponent.

Protestants may exclaim that Rome has ever been a corrupting religion; that even the confessional has been made the instrument of profligacy. No doubt these things have often been true; yet another thing is visibly true in these United States: that while degrading views of the marriage relation and of the honor of parentage are eating out the life of so many nominal Protestant families, and bringing them to total extinction, the families of Romanists are better protected from

this blight. Their houses are peopled with children, while the homes of rich Protestants are too elegant and luxurious for such nuisances. By the very force of the Malthusian law of population Romanism is growing, while Protestantism stands still.

I have thus described six distinct lines of influence which our unfaithfulness to our principles has betrayed into the hands of the Romanist. They are using them all with constant effect, and we, at least, cannot blame them.

II. I now proceed to explain certain evil principles of human nature which are concurring powerfully in this country to give currency to popery. These may be called its illicit advantages. I mention:

(1.) The constant tendency of American demagogues to pay court to popery and to purchase votes for themselves from it, at the cost of the people's safety, rights and money. Nearly two generations ago (the men of this day seem to have forgotten the infamy) William H. Seward, of New York, began this dangerous and dishonest game. He wished to be Governor of New York. He came to an understanding with Archbishop Hughes, then the head of the popish hierarchy in that State, to give him the Irish vote in return for certain sectarian advantages in the disbursement of the State revenues. Neither Rome nor the demagogues have since forgotten their lesson, nor will they ever forget it. It would be as unreasonable to expect it as to expect that hawks will forget the poultry yard. It is the nature of the demagogue to trade off anything for votes; they are the breath in the nostrils of his ambition. The popish hierarchy differs essentially from the ministry of any other religion, in having votes to trade. The traditional claim of Rome is that she has the right to control both spheres, the ecclesiastical and the political, the political for the sake of the ecclesiastical. The votes of her masses are more or less manageable, as the votes of Protestants are not, because Rome's is a system of authority as opposed to free thought. Rome instructs the conscience of every one of her members that it is his religious duty to subordinate all other duties and interests to hers. And this is a spiritual duty enforceable by the most awful spiritual sanctions. How can a thinking man afford to disobey the hierarchy which holds his eternal destiny in its secret fist; so that

even if they gave him in form the essential sacraments, such as the mass, absolution, and extreme unction, they are able clandestinely to make them worthless to him, by withholding the sacramental intention. Hence it is that the majority of American papists can be voted in "blocks"; and it is virtually the hierarchy which votes them. The goods are ready bound up in parcels for traffic with demagogues. We are well aware that numerous papists will indignantly deny this; declaring that there is a Romanist vote in this country which is just as independent of their priesthood and as free as any other. Of course there is. The hierarchy is a very experienced and dextrous driver. It does not whip in the restive colts, but humors them awhile until she gets them well harnessed and broken. But the team as a whole must yet travel her road, because they have to believe it infallible. We assure these independent Romanist voters that they are not "good Catholics"; they must unlearn this heresy of independent thought before they are meet for the Romanist paradise. Men of secular ambition have always sought to use the hierarchy to influence others for their political advantage; the example is as old as history. Just as soon as prelacy was developed in the patristic church, Roman emperors began to purchase its influence to sustain their thrones. Throughout the Middle Ages, German kaisers and French, Spanish, and English kings habitually traded with Rome, paying her dignities and endowments for her ghostly support to their ambitions. Even in this century we have seen the two Napoleons playing the same game—purchasing for their imperialism the support of a priesthood in whose religion they did not believe. If any suppose that because America is nominally democratic the same thing will not happen here, they are thoroughly silly. Some Yankee ingenuity will be invoked to modify the forms of the traffic, so as to suit American names; that is all.

Intelligent students of church history know that one main agency for converting primitive Christianity first into prelacy and then into popery was unlimited church endowments. As soon as Constantine established Christianity as the religion of the State, ecclesiastical persons and bodies began to assume the virtual (and before long the formal) rights of corporations. They could receive bequests and gifts of property, and hold them by

a tenure as firm as that of the fee-simple. These spiritual corporations were deathless. Thus the property they acquired was all held by the tenure of *mortmain*. When a corporation is thus empowered to absorb continually, and never to disgorge, there is no limit to its possible wealth. The laws of the empire in the Middle Ages imposed no limitations upon bequests; thus, most naturally, monasteries, cathedrals, chapters, and archbishoprics became inordinately rich. At the Reformation they had grasped one-third of the property of Europe. But Scripture saith, "Where the carcass is, thither the eagles are gathered together." Wealth is power, and ambitious men crave it. Thus this endowed hierarchy came to be filled by the men of the greediest ambition in Europe, instead of by humble, self-denying pastors; and thus it was that this tremendous money power, arming itself first with a spiritual despotism of the popish theology over consciences, and then allying itself with political power, wielded the whole to enforce the absolute domination of that religion which gave them their wealth. No wonder human liberty, free thought, and the Bible were together trampled out of Europe. When the Reformation came, the men who could think saw that this tenure in *mortmain* had been the fatal thing. Knox, the wisest of them, saw clearly that if a religious reformation was to succeed in Scotland the ecclesiastical corporations must be destroyed. They were destroyed, their whole property alienated to the secular nobles or to the State (the remnant which Knox secured for religious education); and therefore it was that Scotland remained Presbyterian. When our American commonwealths were founded, statesmen and divines understood this great principle of jurisprudence, that no corporate tenure in *mortmain*, either spiritual or secular, is compatible with the liberty of the people and the continuance of constitutional government.

But it would appear that our legislators now know nothing about that great principle, or care nothing about it. Church institutions, Protestant and Romanist, are virtually perpetual corporations. Whatever the pious choose to give them is held in *mortmain*, and they grow continually richer and richer; they do not even pay taxes, and there seems no limit upon their acquisitions. And last comes the Supreme Court of the United States, and under the pretext of construing the law, legislates a new

law in the famous Walnut-street Church case, as though they desired to ensure both the corruption of religion and the destruction of free government by a second gigantic incubus of endowed ecclesiasticism. The new law is virtually this: That in case any free citizen deems that the gifts of himself or his ancestors are usurped for some use alien to the designed trust, *it shall be the usurper who shall decide the issue.* This is, of course, essentially popish, yet a great Protestant denomination has been seen hastening to enroll it in its digest of spiritual laws.\* The working of this tendency of overgrown ecclesiastical wealth will certainly be two-fold: First, to Romanize partially or wholly the Protestant churches thus enriched; and, secondly, to incline, enable, and equip the religion thus Romanized for its alliance with political ambition and for the subjugation of the people and the government. When church bodies began, under Constantine, to acquire endowments, these bodies were Episcopal, at most, or even still Presbyterian. The increase of endowment helped to make them popish. Then popery and feudalism stamped out the Bible and enslaved Europe. If time permitted, I could trace out the lines of causation into perfect clearness. Will men ever learn that like causes must produce like effects?

(2.) The democratic theory of human society may be the most rational and equitable; but human nature is not equitable; it is fallen and perverted. Lust of applause, pride, vain-glory, and love of power are as natural to it as hunger to the body. Next to Adam, the most representative man upon earth was Diotrephes, "who loves to have the pre-eminence." Every man is an aristocrat in his heart. Now, prelacy and popery are aristocratic religions. Consequently, as long as human nature is natural, they will present more or less of attraction to human minds. Quite a number of Methodist, Presbyterian, or Independent ministers have gone over to prelacy or popery, and thus become bishops. Was there ever one of them, however conscientious his new faith, and however devout his temper, who did not find some elation and pleasure in his spiritual dignity? Is there a democrat in democratic America who would not be flattered in his heart by being addressed as "my lord?" Distinction and power are gratifying to all men. Prelacy and

popery offer this sweet morsel to aspirants by promising to make some of them lords of their brethren. This is enough to entice all of them, as the crown entices all the racers on the race-course. It is true that while many run, one obtaineth the crown; but all may flatter themselves with the hope of winning. Especially does the pretension of sacramental grace offer the most splendid bait to human ambition which can be conceived of on this earth. To be the vicar of the Almighty in dispensing eternal life and heavenly crowns at will is a more magnificent power than the prerogative of any emperor on earth. Let a man once be persuaded that he really grasps this power by getting a place in the apostolic succession, and the more sincere he is, the more splendid the prerogative will appear to him; for the more clearly his faith appreciates the thing that he proposes to do in the sacraments, the more illustrious that thing must appear. The greatest boon ever inherited by an emperor was finite. The boon of redemption is infinite; to be able to dispense it at will to one sinner is a much grander thing than to conquer the world and establish a universal secular empire. The humblest "hedge-priest" would be a far grander man than that emperor if he could really work the miracle and confer the grace of redemption which Rome says he does every time he consecrates a mass. How shall we estimate, then, the greatness of that pope or prelate who can manufacture such miracle workers at will? The greatest being on earth should hardly think himself worthy to loose his sandals from his feet. The Turkish ambassador to Paris was certainly right when, upon accompanying the King of France to high mass in Notre Dame, and seeing the king, courtiers and multitude all prostrate themselves when the priest elevated the Host, he wondered that the king should allow anybody but himself to perform that magnificent function. He is reported to have said: "Sire, if I were king, and believed in your religion, nobody should do that in France except me. It is a vastly greater thing than anything else that you do in your royal functions." As long as man is man, therefore, popery will possess this unhallowed advantage of enticing, and even entrancing, the ambition of the keenest aspirants. The stronger their faith in their doctrine, the more will they sanctify to themselves this dreadful ambition. In this respect, as in so many others, the tendency of the whole



current of human nature is to make papists. It is converting grace only which can check that current and turn men sincerely back towards Protestantism. I am well aware that the functions of the Protestant minister may be so wrested as to present an appeal to unhallowed ambition. But popery professes to confer upon her clergy every didactic and presbyterial function which Protestantism has to bestow; while the former offers, in addition, this splendid bait of prelatic power and sacramental miracle-working.

(3.) All the churches which call themselves Protestant, even the strictest, now betray the silent influence of those Romanizing tendencies which have been and are hereafter to be explained. There is an almost universal letting down of the old standard of doctrine and worship. A comparison of prevalent usages of to-day and of seventy years ago in the Methodist, Baptist, Congregational and Presbyterian Churches (except those of the Secession) would startle any thinking mind. Every one of them now admits usages which were then universally rejected by them, such as architectural pomps, pictured windows, floral decorations, instrumental and operatic music. One may say, that these are matters of indifference which cannot be proved anti-scriptural; but every sensible man knows that they proceed from one impulse, the craving for a more spectacular and ritualistic worship. This is precisely the impulse which brought about prelacy and popery in the patristic ages. The strictest Protestant communions are now moving upon the same inclined plane. The descent is gentle, at first, but as it proceeds it grows steeper; and at the bottom is popery. The prelatic churches of America now notoriously occupy the middle and advanced parts of this course. Forty years ago, when things were not near so bad with them as now, the head of the American popish hierarchy pointed an eminent Presbyterian divine to a dainty Puseyite clergyman tripping by, and said, with a sardonic smile: "Doctor, those are the cattle who do our plowing for us gratis. They leave us little to do. My only objection to their work is, that they make their perverts rather too popish to suit my taste as a Romanist." This Right Reverend was, of course, an Irishman. Episcopalians who teach baptismal regeneration, the real presence, the apostolic succession and such like dogmas, must inevitably propel their

pupils towards popery. If their favorite doctrines have any foundation in logic or Scripture, that foundation sustains popery as fully as prelacy. When one fixes the premises in the minds of his pupils, he should expect to see them sooner or later proceed to the logical consequence; as all rivers run to the ocean, so the ultimate destiny of all high churchism is Rome. These covert educators for popery are more efficient for evil than the overt ones. I fear those who are on the road to the Eternal City more than those who have fixed their abode there. This head of my argument is, then, that Romanism is sure to win in America, because most of those who profess to be Protestants are really helping her by preparing her way.

(4.) In sundry respects I perceive a sort of hallucination prevailing in people's minds concerning old historical errors and abuses, which I see to have been the regular results of human nature. Men will not understand history; they flatter themselves that, because the modes of civilization are much changed and advanced, therefore the essential laws of man's nature are going to cease acting; which is just as unreasonable as to expect that sinful human beings must entirely cease to be untruthful, sensual, dishonest, and selfish, because they have gotten to wear fine clothes. Of certain evils and abuses of ancient history men persuade themselves that they are no longer possible among us, because we have become civilized and nominally Christian. One of these evils is idolatry with its two branches, polytheism and image-worship. Oh! they say, mankind has outgrown all that; other evils may invade our Christian civilization, but that is too gross to come back again. They are blind at once to the teachings of historical facts and to common sense. They know that at one time idolatry nearly filled the ancient world. Well, what was the previous religious state of mankind upon which it supervened? Virtually a Christian state, that is to say, a worship of the one true God, under the light of revelation, with our same gospel taught by promises and sacrifices. And it is very stupid to suppose that the social state upon which the early idolatry supervened was savage or barbaric. We rather conclude that the people who built Noah's ark, the tower of Babel, and the pyramid of Cheops, and who enjoyed the light of God's recent revelations to Adam, to Enoch, to Noah, were civilized. Men make a strange confusion here:

They fancy that idolatry could be prevalent because mankind were not civilized. The historical fact is just the opposite: Mankind became uncivilized because idolatry first prevailed. In truth, the principles tending to idolatry are deeply laid in man's fallen nature. Like a compressed spring, they are ever ready to act again, and will surely begin to act, whenever the opposing power of vital godliness is withdrawn. First, the sensuous has become too prominent in man; reason, conscience, and faith, too feeble. Every sinful man's experience witnesses this all day long, every day of his life. Why else is it that the objects of sense-perception, which are comparatively trivial, dominate his attention, his sensibilities, and his desires so much more than the objects of faith, which he himself knows to be so much more important? Did not this sensuous tendency seek to invade man's religious ideas and feelings, it would be strange indeed. Hence, man untaught and unchecked by the heavenly light always shows a craving for sensuous objects of worship. He is not likely, in our day, to satisfy this craving by setting up a brazen image of Dagon, the fish-god; or of Zeus, or the Roman Jupiter; or of the Aztecs' Itzlahuitl. But still he craves a visible, material object of worship. Rome meets him at a comfortable half-way station with her relics, crucifixes, and images of the saints. She adroitly smoothes the downhill road for him by connecting all these with the worship of the true God. Again, man's conscious weakness impels him almost irresistibly in his serious hours to seek some being of supernatural attributes to lean upon. His heart cries out, "Lead me to the Rock that is higher than I." But when pure monotheism proposes to him the supreme, eternal God—infinite not only in his power to help, but in his omniscience, justice, and holiness—the sinful heart recoils. This object is too high, too holy, too dreadful for it. Sinful man craves a God, but, like his first father, shuns the infinite God; hence the powerful tendency to invent intermediate gods, whom he may persuade himself to be sufficiently gracious and powerful to be trusted, and yet not so infinite, immutable, and holy as inevitably to condemn sin. Here is the impulse which prompted all pagan nations to invent polytheism. This they did by filling the space between man and the supreme being with intermediate gods. Such, among the Greeks, were Bacchus, Hercules, Castor and Pollux, Theseus, Aesculapins, etc. It is a great mistake to suppose that thoughtful

pagans did not recognize the unity and eternity of a supreme God, "Father of gods and of men." But sometimes they represent him as so exalted and sublimated as to be at once above the reach of human prayers and above all concernment in human affairs. Others thought of him as too awful to be directly approached, accessible only through the mediation of his own next progeny, the secondary gods. Here we have precisely the impulse for which Rome provides in her saint-worship. Mary is the highest of the intermediate gods, next to the trinity, the intercessor for Christ's intercession. The apostles and saints are the secondary gods of this Christian pantheon. How strangely has God's predestination led Rome in the development of her history to the unwitting admission of this indictment! Pagan Rome had her marble temple, the gift of Agrippa to the Commonwealth, the Pantheon, or sanctuary of all the gods. This very building stands now, rededicated by the popes as the temple of Christ and all the saints. So fateful has been the force of this analogy between the old polytheism and the new.

The attempt is made, indeed, to hide the likeness by the sophistical distinction between *latría* and *dulia*; but its worthlessness appears from this, that even *dulia* cannot be offered to redeemed creatures without ascribing to them, by an unavoidable implication, the attributes peculiar to God. In one word, fallen men of all ages have betrayed a powerful tendency to image-worship and polytheism. Rome provides for that tendency in a way the most adroit possible, for an age nominally Christian but practically unbelieving. To that tendency the religion of the Bible sternly refuses to concede anything, requiring not its gratification, but its extirpation. This cunning policy of Rome had sweeping success in the early church. The same principle won almost universal success in the ancient world. It will succeed again here. Many will exclaim that this prognostic is wholly erroneous; that the great, bad tendency of our age and country is to agnosticism as against all religions. I am not mistaken. This drift will be as temporary as it is partial. M. Guizot says in his *Meditations*: "One never need go far back in history to find atheism advancing half way to meet superstition." A wiser analyst of human nature says: "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge,

God gave them over to a reprobate mind." "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." This is the exact pathology of superstition. When the culture of the Augustan age taught the Romans to despise the religious faith of their fathers, there was an interval of agnosticism. But next, the most refined of the agnostics were seen studying the mysteries of Isis and practicing the foulest rites of the paganism of the conquered provinces. Atheism is too freezing a blank for human souls to inhabit permanently. It outrages too many of the heart's affections and of the reason's first principles. A people who have cast away their God, when they discover this, turn to false gods. For all such wandering spirits Rome stands with open doors; there, finally, they will see their most convenient refuge of superstition in a catalogue of Christian saints transformed into a polytheism. Thus the cravings of superstition are satisfied, while the crime is veiled from the conscience by this pretence of scriptural origin.

(5.) I proceed to unfold an attraction of Romanism far more seductive. This is its proposal to satisfy man's guilty heart by a ritual instead of a spiritual salvation. As all know who understand the popish theology, the proposed vehicle of this redemption by forms is the sacraments. Romanists are taught that the New Testament sacraments differ from those of the Old Testament in this: that they not only symbolize and seal, *but effectuate grace ex opere operato* in the souls of the recipients. Rome teaches her children that her sacraments are actual charismatic power of direct supernatural efficiency wrought upon recipients by virtue of a portion of the Holy Spirit's omnipotence conferred upon the priest in ordination from the apostolic succession. The Bible teaches that in the case of all adults a gracious state must pre-exist in order for any beneficial participation in the sacrament, and that the only influence of the sacraments is to cherish and advance that pre-existing spiritual life by their didactic effect, as energized by God's Spirit, through prayer, faith, watchfulness, and obedience, in precisely the same generic mode in which the Holy Spirit energizes the written and preached word. Hence, if watchfulness, prayer, obedience, and a life of faith are neglected, our sacra-

ments become no sacraments. If thou be a breaker of the law, thy "circumcision is made uncircumcision." But Rome teaches that her sacraments, duly administered by a priest having apostolic succession, *implant spiritual life* in souls hitherto dead in sin, and that they maintain and foster this life by a direct power not dependent on the recipient's diligent exercise of gospel principles. Provided the recipient be not in mortal sin unab-solved, the sacrament does its spiritual work upon the sinful soul, whether it receives it in the exercise of saving grace or not. (See the article, "Prelacy a Blunder," in *Collected Discussions*, Vol. II., p. 218.)

Now let no Protestant mind exclaim: "Surely this is too gross to be popular; surely people will have too much sense to think that they can get to heaven by this species of consecrated jugglery!" History shows that this scheme of redemption is almost universally acceptable and warmly popular with sinful mankind. Apprehend aright the ideas of paganism, ancient and modern: we perceive that this popish conception of sacraments is virtually the same with the pagan's conception of their heathen rites. They claim to be just this species of saving ritual, working their benefit upon souls precisely by this *opus operatum* agency. What a commentary have we here upon this tendency of human nature to a ritual salvation. The evangelists and apostles reintroduced to the world the pure conception of a spiritual salvation wrought by the energy of divine truth, and not of church rites; received by an intelligent faith in the saved man's soul, and not by manual ceremonial; and made effectual by the enlightening operation of the Holy Ghost upon heart and mind in rational accordance with truth, not by a priestly incantation working a physical miracle. The gospels and epistles defined and separated the two conceptions as plainly as words could do it. But no sooner were the apostles gone than the pagan conception of salvation by ritual, instead of by rational faith, began to creep back into the patristic church. In a few hundred years the wrong conception had triumphed completely over the correct one in nearly the whole of christendom, and thenceforward sacramental grace has reigned supreme over the whole Roman and Greek communions, in spite of modern letters and culture. How startling this commentary upon that tendency of human nature! Surely there are deep-seated prin-

ciples in man to account for it.

These are not far to seek. First, men are sensuous beings, and hence they naturally crave something concrete, material, and spectacular in their religion. Dominated as they are by a perpetual current of sensations, and having their animality exaggerated by their sinful nature, they are sluggish to think spiritual truths, to look by faith upon invisible objects; they crave to walk by sight rather than by faith. The material things in mammon, the sensual pleasures which they see with their eyes and handle with their fingers, although they perfectly know they perish with the using, obscure their view of all the infinite, eternal realities, notwithstanding their professed belief of them. Need we wonder that with such creatures the visible and manual ritual should prevail over the spiritual didactic? Does one exclaim, "But this is so unreasonable—this notion that a ritual ceremonial can change the state and destiny of a rational and moral spirit?" I reply, "Yes, but not one whit more irrational than the preference which the whole natural world gives to the things which are seen and temporal, as it perfectly knows, over the things which are unseen and eternal; an insanity of which the educated and refined are found just as capable as the ignorant and brutish." But the other principle of human nature is still more keen and pronounced in its preference for a ritual salvation. This is its deep-seated, omnipotent preference for self-will and sin over spiritual holiness of life. The natural man has, indeed, his natural conscience and remorse, his fearful looking for of judgment, his natural fear of misery, which is but modified selfishness. These make everlasting punishment very terrible to his apprehension.

But enmity to God, to his spiritual service, to the supremacy of his holy will, is as native to him as his selfish fear is. Next to perdition, there is no conception in the universe so repulsive to the sinful heart of man as that of genuine repentance and its fruits. The true gospel comes to him and says: Here is, indeed, a blessed, glorious redemption, as free as air, as secure as the throne of God, but instrumentally it is conditional on the faith of the heart; which faith works by love, purifies the heart, and can only exist as it co-exists with genuine repentance, which repentance turns honestly, unreservedly, here and now, without shuffling or procrastination, from sin unto God,

with full purpose of and endeavor after new obedience; which is, in fact, a complete surrender of the sinful will to God's holy will, and a hearty enlistment in an arduous work of watchfulness, self-denial, and self-discipline, for the sake of inward holiness, to be kept up as long as life lasts. Soul, embrace this task, and this splendid salvation shall be yours; and the gracious Saviour, who purchases it for you, shall sustain, comfort, and enable you in this arduous enlistment, so that even in the midst of the warfare you shall find rest, and at the end heaven; but without this faith and this repentance no sacraments or rights will do a particle of good towards your salvation. Now, this carnal soul has no faith; it is utterly mistrustful and skeptical as to the possibility of this peace of the heart in the spiritual warfare, this sustaining power of the invisible hand, of which it has had no experience. This complete subjugation of self-will to God, this life of self-denial and vital godliness, appears to this soul utterly repulsive, yea, terrible. This guilty soul dreads hell; it abhors such a life only less than hell. When told by Protestantism that it must thus "turn or die," this carnal soul finds itself in an abhorrent dilemma; either term of the alternative is abominable to it. But now comes the theory of sacramental grace and says to it with oily tongue: "Oh! Protestantism exaggerates the dilemma! Your case is not near so bad! The sacraments of the church transfer you from the state of condemnation to that of reconciliation by their own direct but mysterious efficiency; they work real grace, though you do not bring to them this deep, thorough-going self-sacrifice and self-consecration. No matter how much you sin, or how often, repeated masses will make expiation for the guilt of all those sins *ex opere operato*. Thus, with her other sacraments of penance and extreme unction, Holy Mother Church will repair all your short-comings and put you back into a salvable state, no matter how sinfully you live." Need we wonder that this false doctrine is as sweet to that guilty soul as a reprieve to the felon at the foot of the gallows? He can draw his breath again; he can say to himself: "Ah, then the abhorred dilemma does not urge me here and now; I can postpone this hated reformation; I can still tamper with cherished sins without embracing perdition." This is a pleasant doctrine; it suits so perfectly the sinful, selfish soul which does not wish to part with its sins, and also does not wish to lie down in everlasting burnings.



This deep-seated love of sin and self has also another result: The soul is conscious that, if it must do many things which it does not like in order to avoid perdition, it is much pleasanter to do a number of ceremonial things than to do any portion of spiritual heart-work. After I stood my graduate examination in philosophy at the University of Virginia, my professor, the venerable George Tucker, showed me a cheating apparatus which had been prepared by a member of the class. He had unluckily dropped it upon the sidewalk, and it had found its way to the professor's hands. It was a narrow blank-book, made to be hidden in the coat-sleeve. It contained, in exceedingly small penmanship, the whole course, in the form of questions from the professor's recitations with their answers copied from the text-book. It was really a work of much labor. I said, "The strange thing to me is, that this sorry fellow has expended upon this fraud much more hard labor than would have enabled him to prepare himself for passing honestly and honorably." Mr. Tucker replied, "Ah, my dear sir, you forget that a dunce finds it easier to do any amount of mere manual drudgery than the least bit of true thinking." Here we have an exact illustration. It is less irksome to the carnal mind to do twelve dozen pater-nosters by the beads than to do a few moments of real heart-work. Thoughtless people sometimes say that the rule of Romish piety is more exacting than that of the Protestant. This is the explanation, that Rome is more exacting as to form and ritual; Bible religion is more exacting as to spiritual piety and vital godliness. To the carnal mind the latter are almost insufferably irksome and laborious; the form and ritual, easy and tolerable. And when remorse, fear, and self-righteousness are gratified by the assurance that these observances really promote the soul's salvation, the task is made light. Here Rome will always present an element of popularity as long as mankind are sensuous and carnal.

(6.) To a shallow view, it might appear that the popish doctrine of purgatory should be quite a repulsive element of unpopularity with sinners; that doctrine is, that notwithstanding all the benefit of the church's sacraments and the believer's efforts, no Christian soul goes direct to heaven when the body dies, except those of the martyrs, and a few eminent saints, who are, as it were, miracles of sanctification in this life. All the

clergy, and even the popes, must go through purgatory in spite of the apostolic succession and the infallibility. There the remains of carnality in all must be burned away, and the deficiencies of their penitential work in this life made good, by enduring penal fires and torments for a shorter or longer time. Then the Christian souls, finally purged from depravity and the *reum paenae*, enter into their final rest with Christ. But the alms, prayers, and masses of survivors avail much to help these Christian souls in purgatory and shorten their sufferings. It might be supposed that the Protestant doctrine should be much more attractive and popular, viz.: that there is no purgatory or intermediate state for the spirits of dead men, but that the "souls of believers, being at their death made perfect in holiness, do immediately enter into glory." This ought to be the more attractive doctrine, and to Bible believers it is such, but there is a feature about it which makes it intensely unpopular and repellent to carnal men, and gives a powerful advantage with them to the popish scheme. That feature is, the sharpness and strictness of the alternative which the Bible doctrine presses upon sinners: "turn or die."

The Bible offers the most blessed and glorious redemption conceivable by man, gracious and free, and bestowing a consummate blessedness the moment the body dies. But it is on these terms that the gospel must be embraced by a penitent faith, working an honest and thorough revolution in the life. If the sinner refuses this until this life ends, he seals his fate; and that fate is final, unchangeable, and dreadful. Now, it is no consolation to the carnal heart that the gospel assures him he need not run any risk of that horrible fate; that he has only to turn and live; that very turning is the thing which he abhors, if it is to be done in spirit and in truth. He intensely desires to retain his sin and self-will. He craves earnestly to put off the evil day of this sacrifice without incurring the irreparable penalty. Now, Rome comes to him and tells him that this Protestant doctrine is unnecessarily harsh; that a sinner may continue in the indulgence of his sins until this life ends, and yet not seal himself up thereby to a hopeless hell; that if he is in communion with the Holy Mother Church through her sacraments, he may indulge himself in this darling procrastination without ruining himself forever. Thus the hateful neces-

sity of present repentance is postponed awhile; sweet, precious privilege to the sinner! True, he must expect to pay due penance for that self-indulgence in purgatory, but he need not perish for it. The Mother Church advises him not to make so bad a bargain and pay so dear for his whistle. But she assures him that, if he does, it need not ruin him, for she will pull him through after a little by her merits and sacraments. How consoling this is to the heart at once in love with sin and remorseful for its guilt! The seductiveness of this theory of redemption to the natural heart is proved by this grand fact, that in principle and in its essence this scheme of purgatorial cleansing has had a prominent place in every religion in the world that is of human invention. The Bible, the one divine religion, is peculiar in rejecting the whole concept. Those hoary religions, Brahmanism and Buddhism, give their followers the virtual advantage of this conception in the transmigration of their souls. The guilt of the sinner's human life may be expiated by the sorrows of the soul's existence in a series of animal or reptile bodies, and then through another human existence, the penitent and purified soul may at last reach heaven. Classic paganism promised the same escape for sinners, as all familiar with Virgil know. His hero, Aeneas, when visiting the under world, saw many sinners there preparing for their release into the Elysian fields. *Ergo exercentur poenis, et veterum malorum supplicia expendunt.* Mohammed extends the same hope to all his sinful followers. For those who entirely reject Islam there is nothing but hell; but for all who profess "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet," there is a purgatory after death, and its pains are shortened by his intercession. The Roman and Greek Churches flatter the sinful world with the same human invention. So strong is this craving of carnal men to postpone the issue of turning to God or perishing. We now see its effect upon the most cultured minds of this advanced nineteenth century in the New England doctrine of a "second probation." Rome has understood human nature skilfully, and has adapted her bait for it with consummate cunning. Her scheme is much more acute than that of the absolute universalist of the school of Hosea Ballou, for this outrages man's moral intuitions too grossly by rejecting all distinction between guilt and righteousness. This bait for sin-loving men is too bald.

It must be added that the doctrine of a purgatory and of an application of redemption after death is intensely attractive to other principles of the human heart, much more excusable; to some affections, indeed, which are amiable. I allude to the solicitude and the affection of believers for the souls of those whom they loved in this life, "who died and made no sign." The Bible doctrine is, indeed, a solemn, an awful one to Christians bereaved by the impenitent deaths of children and relatives. It is our duty to foresee this solemn result, and to provide against it by doing everything which intercessory prayer, holy example and loving instruction and entreaty can do to prevent such a catastrophe in the case of all those near to our hearts. But human self-indulgence is prone to be slack in employing this safeguard against this sorrow. Let us picture to ourselves such a bereaved Christian, sincere, yet partially self-condemned, and doubtful or fearful or hopeless concerning the thorough conversion of a child who has been cut down by death. Of all the elements of bereavement none is so bitter, so immedicable, as the fear that he whom he loved must suffer the wrath of God forever, and that now he is beyond reach of his prayers and help. To such a one comes the Romish priest with this species of discourse. See now how harsh and cruel is this heretical Protestant dogma! Instead of offering consolation to your Christian sorrow it embitters it as with a drop of hell fire. But Holy Mother Church is a mild and loving comforter; she assures you that your loved one is not necessarily lost; he may have to endure keen penances in purgatory for a time, but there is a glorious hope to sustain him and you under them. Every minute of pain is bringing the final heaven nearer, and the most blessed part of our teaching is that your love can still follow him and help him and bless, as it was wont to do under those earthly chastisements of his sins. It is your privilege still to pray for him, and your prayers avail to lighten his sufferings and to shorten them. Your love can still find that generous solace which was always so sweet to you amidst your former sorrows for his sins and his earthly sufferings—the solace of helping him and sharing his pains. Your alms also may avail for him; masses can be multiplied by your means, which will make merit to atone for his penitential guilt and hasten his blessed release. Who can doubt that a loving heart will be

powerfully seduced by this promise, provided it can persuade itself of its certainty, or even of its probable truth? Here is the stronghold of Romanism on sincere, amiable, and affectionate souls. Of course, the real question is, whether any pastor or priest is authorized by God to hold out these hopes to the bereaved. If they are unwarrantable, then this presentation is an artifice of unspeakable cruelty and profanity. Under the pretence of softening the pain of bereavement to God's children, it is adding to wicked deception the most mischievous influences upon the living by contradicting those solemn incentives to immediate repentance which God has set up in his word, and by tempting deluded souls with a false hope to neglect their real opportunity. If the hope is not grounded in the word of God, then its cruelty is equal to its deceitfulness. But the suffering heart is often weak, and it is easier to yield to the temptation of accepting a deceitful consolation than to brace itself up to the plain but stern duty of ascertaining God's truth.

I have thus set in array the influences which Rome is now wielding throughout our country for the seduction of human souls. Some of these weapons Protestants put into her hands by their own unfaithfulness and folly. God has a right to blame Rome for using this species of weapon in favor of the wrong cause, but these Protestants have not.

There is another class of weapons which Rome finds in the blindness and sinfulness of human nature. Her guilt may be justly summed up in this statement: That these are precisely the errors and crimes of humanity which the church of Christ should have labored to suppress and extirpate; whereas Rome caters to them and fosters them in order to use them for her aggrandizement. But none the less are these weapons potent. They are exactly adapted to the nature of fallen man. As they always have been successful, they will continue to succeed in this country. Our republican civil constitutions will prove no adequate shield against them. Our rationalistic culture, by weakening the authority of God's word, is only opening the way for their ulterior victory. Our scriptural ecclesiastical order will be no sufficient bulwark. The primitive churches had that bulwark in its strongest Presbyterian form, but popery steadily undermined it. What it did once it can do again. There will be no effectual check upon another spread of this error except the work of the Holy Ghost. True and powerful revivals will save American Protestantism; nothing else will.

## THE INFLUENCE OF FALSE PHILOSOPHIES UPON CHARACTER AND CONDUCT.<sup>1</sup>

---

Thoughtful men who read the various schools of philosophy are struck with one feature common to the erroneous theories. This is the lofty assumption by their authors of complete irresponsibility for results. Let the corollaries of their positions be destructive to either ethics or theology, that does not concern them. They say, philosophy has its supreme rights, let them prevail, whatever else perishes. This, of course, clearly implies the cool assumption by each author that his philosophy is the absolutely true one; which again implies that he believes himself infallible in it. Yet each contradicts the sound philosophers, and also each of his fellow heretics. Schwegler disdains all the great scholastics, pronouncing them incapable of real philosophy, because they avowed the supremacy of the Roman theology over all speculation. He evidently knows little about them, or he would have been aware how little their license of philosophic speculation was really curbed by pretended respect for Bible, councils, or popes. They could always evade their restraints by their distinction—that what was theologically true, might yet be philosophically false.

Now it is as plain as common sense can make it, that if there are any propositions of natural theology logically established, if any principle of ethics impreguably grounded in man's universal, necessary judgments, if any infallible revelation, any philosophy that conflicts with either of these is thereby proven false. Now, I believe there is an infallible revelation. Therefore, unless I am willing to become infidel, the pretended philosopher who impinges against revelation has no claim on me to be even listened to, much less believed; unless he has proved himself infallible. There are also fundamental moral principles supported by the universal experience and consent of mankind, and regulating the laws of all civilized nations in all ages. All

---

1—Appeared in *Homiletic Review*, January, 1896.

human history and God's Word testify, moreover, that the dominancy of these moral principles is the supreme end for which the universe exists, and for which Providence rules (read Butler's "Analogy"). The rule of God's final judgment is to be: everlasting good to the righteous, condemnation to the wicked. Here then is a criterion, as firmly established as the foundations of human reason and the pillars of God's throne. He who discards this criterion makes man a reasonless brute, and the world an atheistic chaos; that man has no longer any right to any philosophy, any more than a pig. For has he not discarded the essential conditions of all philosophy, intuitive reasons in man, and rational order in the series of causes and effects? We may, therefore, safely adopt this criterion as a touchstone for every philosophy—that if it unsettles conscience and God, it is erroneous.

I have now brought my reader to the eminent point of view from which he sees that the real tendency of all false philosophy must, in the end, be against good morals and religion. Lord Bacon has nobly said that all the lines of true philosophy converge upward to God. The ethical criterion, which is the final, supreme rule of God, mankind, and the universe, must be the apex of a true philosophy. The philosophic lines which curve aside from God and right morals must therefore, in the end, pervert character and conduct.

I shall be told that many speculators, whose philosophy I hold wrong, lived better lives, perhaps, than mine. A Spinoza, a Fichte, a Littré, a Stuart Mill, a Tyndall, were virtuous men; even Helvetius was an amiable neighbor, and an honest fiscal officer. Granted. Again, they resent my conclusion, as a bigot's insult, and a tyrannical bond upon philosophic freedom of thought. I reply: Nobody has any freedom rightfully to think against God and righteousness. I reply again: I have asserted this evil tendency, as only a tendency, in many, not always a present result. Personally, I am glad to give full credit to the good character of individual opponents. Again, the virtues of these errorists were really the fruits of the side influences and social habitudes of the very religion and philosophy which they tried to discard. Spinoza was reared by Jewish parents under monotheism and the ten commandments. Fichte, like Kant, was a candidate for the Lutheran ministry. Tyndall and Dra-

per were both sons of pious non-conformist ministers in England. But the real question is: What of the moral influence of their philosophies on the untrained and ignorant masses? Lastly, whatever the civic virtue of these gentlemen, none of them ever pretended to spiritual sanctity; which is the higher and only immortal phase of virtue. The character which regards man, the less, but disregards God, the greater, can not be wholly sound, and can not retain its partial soundness permanently. This is the inspired argument; and it is *a fortiori*:

"A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master; if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name" (Mal. i. 6).

I. A question concerning the influence of a false philosophy may be tried historically. Here are the facts. The national philosophy of China is that of Confucius, which, we are told, is simply modern agnosticism. The civil administration of China, and the domestic morals, are rotten with corruption. Lying, opium drunkenness, cruelty, bribery, cheating, infanticide are current. India has a great and ancient philosophy—pantheism. Her religions, Brahmanism and Buddhism, are pantheistic. When the British went there, despotism, bribery, polygamy, the suttee, infanticide, official plunderings, lying, and cheating were prevalent institutions. Oaths in court counted for nothing at all in administering justice. Thuggism was a religion. In Greece, the sounder philosophy was supplanted by that of the Epicureans, Sophists, Skeptics, and the New Academy. Then the glory departed, and Greece became vile enough for her slavery. Then Roman virtue also died, and a vast moral rotteness brought on the "decline and fall" of the empire. In the eighteenth century, France adopted the sensualist philosophy of Voltaire, and the selfish ethics of Helvetius. The fruit was the Reign of Terror. In Russia, the Nihilism of Bakunin is a philosophy, that, namely, of materialism and agnosticism; its products are anarchy, prostitution, and assassination. The same philosophy has shown us the same fruits in Paris, New York, and Chicago. Lastly, everybody sorrowfully admits the decadence of political, commercial, and domestic virtue in this country. We need not detail the melancholy instances, or paint the contrast between the Americans of to-



day and the America of Monroe and J. Q. Adams. Since the latter epoch, the philosophy of Comte, Stuart Mill, and Darwin has been rapidly gaining ground.

Shall I be told that these are only chance coincidences and not causal sequences? According to the inductive logic, sequences so regularly recurring raise a strong probability, if not a certainty, of a true causal relation. Again, could instances be adduced of the reverse order, where the incoming of a true philosophy resulted in a decay of morals, our opponents might have some offset to our facts: but there are no such cases.

II. And I now proceed to show that the sequences are causal, by disclosing in these false philosophies obvious causes of corruption.

Here an important fact should be brought forward. Man's moral nature is diseased. Some perversion of will is inherited by every man. Hence, farther moral decay is natural and easy; while the ascent back toward a higher virtue is arduous. Human souls are like a loaded train upon a down grade, whose slight inclination, below the horizontal, increases as it advances. The natural tendency of the train is to descend slowly at first, then with accelerated speed toward the final crash. A good brake (a true philosophy) is quite efficient to keep the train stationary; thus much of good it can do. But the best brake can not push the train upgrade, while a false one, failing to lock the wheels, insures the descent and ruin of the train. Divine grace furnishes the only sure power for driving the train upward against nature. •

I know that it is the trick of all erroneous philosophies to omit or deny this natural evil qualifying the moral disposition of man; to pretend not to see it, to philosophize as though righteousness were as natural to man as sin is. To this arrogance I shall not yield an inch. As a philosophic analysis, it is false; it dishonestly refuses to see a fact in human nature as plain and large as any other fact in psychology. This evil disposition now qualifying man's *essentia* is as clearly proved as any other fundamental instinct, faculty, or appetency. How do they find out that man, unlike the pig or the ox, is an esthetic creature? In the very same way, were they consistent, they should find out that he is by nature a sinning creature. All human experience, all expedients of legislation, all history, every candid con-

sciousness, confirm it. I say, therefore, plainly, that I shall postulate, throughout this discussion, this tendency in man toward moral decadence. It is a fact, and my argument shall be that every dogma in theology, philosophy, politics, or husi-ness, which lifts off the soul any form of moral restraint, tends to moral corruption. Let us see whether each of these false philosophies does not abolish some moral check.

The key-note of Buddhism is, that since feeble man's pursuit of the objects of his appetencies results in failure and pain, his true virtue is to annihilate all appetencies, and thus win *nirvana*. Then, of course, not only the animal, but the social appetencies—sympathy, benevolence, pity, friendship, conjugal, filial, and even parental love—must be expunged out of the philosopher's soul in order to make him holy, forsooth! For the appetencies set in motion by these affections are the occasions of far the deepest and most pungent griefs of human existence. That is to say: the Buddhist saint, in order to be perfect, must make himself a cold, inhuman villain, recreant to every social duty. Such, indeed, their own history makes their chief "hero of the faith," Prince Gautama, who begins his saintship by absconding like a coward, and forsaking all his duties to his wife, his son, his concubines, his parents, and his subjects. But they say he afterward showed sublime altruism by offering his body to be eaten by a hungry tigress, which had not succeeded in torturing and devouring enough antelopes to make milk for her cubs. Bah! methinks he would have done better to care for his own deserted human cub!

Once more, the scheme founds itself on an impossibility. Man can not by his volition expunge native appetencies, because these furnish the only springs of volitions. Can the child be its own father? Eating results in dyspepsia; therefore, not only cease eating absolutely, but cease being hungry. That is the recipe for the distress of dyspepsia! But first, it is impossible; second, were it done, all mankind would be destroyed in a few weeks. Common sense says that when a man goes to professing the impossible he begins to be a cheat. And this is the practical trait of Buddhism.

They say the doctrine of transmigration is a great moral check, teaching the Hindus to avoid sin by the fear of migrating at death into some more miserable animal form. Is it not a

better check to teach them that at death they will at once stand in judgment before an all-wise, just, and almighty Judge? May not that Buddhist doctrine also frequently incite living men to the fiercest brutality to animals, by the supposition that those animals are now animated by the souls of hated enemies?

The pantheism of China, India, and the moderns has common moral features. And the fatal influences are so plain that, while they are of vast and dreadful importance, they may be despatched in few words.

Then, first, when I act, it is God acting. You must not condemn me, whatever villainies I act, because that would be condemning God! Second, whatever men and devils act is but God acting. Then where is the possibility of God's having, in himself, any rational standard of right, by which to condemn our sins? Does God's will in himself judge and condemn his same will emitted in our actions? Or can that will be any moral standard at all which is thus self-contradictory? Such a moral ruler would be worse for the pulpit, than none at all—atheism less confusing and corrupting than pantheism. Third, God's existence and actions are necessary, if any actions are; but God acting, I have no free agency. But if not a free agent, I can not be justly accountable. Fourth, God is an absolute unit and unchangeable being, eternal and necessary. Therefore, if all happiness and misery in creatures are, at bottom, God's own affections, there can be no real difference between happiness and misery (Spinoza's own corollary). What will be the effect of this inference upon that excellent quality, mercy? The dogma must breed indifference to others' suffering, as much as stoicism under one's own. Its tendency is toward a hard-heartedness as pitiless as the tiger, the fire, and the tempest. Fifth, if God is all, there is but one substance in the universe. All other seeming personal beings are modal manifestations of the One. Hence, each creature is but a temporary phenomenon, a wavelet upon this ocean of being. Death, therefore, is a re-absorption into the One. It is *nirvana*, the absolute, eternal extinction of personality and consciousness—thus all pantheists. Then for this other reason there can be no personal responsibility, or reward, or punishment in the future. All the moral restraints of the doctrine of future judgment are as much swept away as by atheism.

We must be brief. Hartmann and Schopenhauer have shown that idealistic pantheism must lead to pessimism. But all our new-fangled philosophies seem to think pessimism a very naughty thing. It is their favorite bad word, with which to pelt a Calvinist, a conservative, or any other whom they dislike—to cry: “Oh, he is a pessimist!” But seriously, is pessimism a hopeful or healthy outlook for a good man? What room does it leave for the trio of supreme virtues: faith, hope, and charity? On this head it is enough to name the charge, often and justly made against the Darwinian doctrine of the “survival of the fittest,” and the fated extinction of the naturally weaker; that it tends to produce a pitiless hardheartedness. The inference is logical; look and see.

The old saw, “Extremes meet,” was never truer than it is of pantheism and atheism. The latter says: “There is no God at all”; the former: “Everything is God.” But the moral results of both are closely akin. In this, my indictment includes genuine Darwinism; for there is now no doubt that Dr. Darwin, like his most consistent pupils, Haeckel, Buchner, etc., believed that the doctrine ought to exclude both spirit and God. Their logic is consistent; for if all teleology is banished out of nature, and if that in man which thinks, feels, and wills is but an evolution of brute impulses, inherent in sensorial matter, there is no spiritual substance. We must have materialistic monism. Then every moral restraint arising out of the expectation of future responsibility, rewards, and punishments, is utterly swept away. Why should men conclude anything but, “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die?” To borrow Carlyle’s rough phrasing: “If mine is a pig’s destiny, why may I not hold this ‘pig philosophy’?” Again, if I am but an animal refined by evolution, I am entitled to live an animal life. Why not? The leaders in this and the sensualistic philosophy may themselves be restrained by their habits of mental culture, social discretion and personal refinement (for which they are indebted to reflex Christian influences); but the herd of common mortals are not cultured and refined, and in them the doctrine will bear its deadly fruit.

Our opponents say that they can discard these old-fashioned restraints of theologic superstitions, and apply better and

more refined checks upon the coarser vices, viz., by showing men that the refined pleasures of temperance, esthetic tastes, culture, and altruism are higher and sweeter than the coarse pleasures of vice; and that the two classes are incompatible, so that the lower should be sacrificed for the higher. Yes; the world has known of that subterfuge from the days of Epicurus; and knows its worthlessness. Here is the fatal reply; and its logic is plain enough to be grasped by the coarsest: "*porcus de grege. Epicuri cute bene curata.*" Refined Mr. Epicurus, it depends entirely upon each man's natural constitutional tastes which class of pleasures shall be to him highest and sweetest. You say that to you music, art, letters are such; you were born so. I am so born that these are but "*caviare*" to me, while my best pleasures are gluttony, drink, lust, gambling, and prize-fights. The philosopher is answered.

Little space remains to me for unmasking the evil tendencies of other sensualistic, expediency, and utilitarian philosophies. The reader must take hints. Their common key-note is: no *a priori*, common, ruling intuitions of necessary, rational truths, either logical or moral. *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu.* Very well! Neither spirit nor God is cognized by any sense-faculty. Therefore, philosophy should know nothing about either. Secondly, the concept of the moral good, or virtuousness in actions, is not cognized by any sense-faculty. Is it seen as a fine color, smelled as a perfume, heard with the ears as a harmony, tasted with the mouth as a savor, felt with the fingers as satin or velvet? No. Then philosophy should know nothing about it. It should say there are no such things in the soul as distinctly ethical feelings; nothing but sensitive ones and their combinations. For mind can only feel as it sees; where it sees nothing it should feel nothing. Then there are two results; there is no science of ethics, nothing but a psychology of sensibilities, which being merely personal, there is no source for any altruism; it is a silly fiction. And, next, since the sensibilities are only moved by objective causes, there is no free agency. Look and see. Hume was logical in becoming fatalist and atheist. So Hobbes, the father of modern sensualism.

Finally, there is a modern class of professed religionists who seem to regard Mill, Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley as very

apostles of philosophy (why, we know not); and when thereafter proclaiming their agnosticism, add, that they still leave room for religion; that while religion has no standing-ground in philosophy, she may be admitted in the sphere of feeling. Our pious neighbors are very thankful! This is the "advanced thought" destined to sweep everything before it; and we are so grateful that it still leaves us a corner for our dear religion! But common sense says: "Thank you for nothing, Messrs. Agnostics. You have not left any corner for our precious religion. Better speak out as honest atheists. The universal law of mind is that it can only feel normally as it sees intelligently. Where there is no logical ground for credence, there should be no source for feeling."

In truth, they let me keep my religion at the price of turning fool!

## THE SAN MARCOS RIVER.

Mysterious river! whence thy hidden source?  
The rain drops from far-distant field and fell,  
Urging through countless paths their darkling course,  
Combine their tiny gifts thy flood to swell.  
What secrets hath thy subterranean stream  
Beheld; as it has bathed the deepest feet  
Of everlasting hills, which never beam  
Of sun or star or lightning's flash did greet?  
Over what cliffs rushed thou in headlong fall  
Into some gulf of Erebus so deep  
Thy very foam was black as midnight's pall;  
And massive roof of rock and mountain steep  
Suppressed thy thunders, so that the quick ears  
Of fauns recumbent on its lofty side  
Heard not; and grass blades, laden with the tears  
Of night dews, felt no quiver from thy tide?  
Through days and weeks, uncounted by the sun,  
Thy waters in abysmal caves have lain  
In slow lustration, ere they sought to run  
Forth to the day, purged from earth's least stain.  
Pallas-Athene of the rivers, thou!  
Who leapest adult in thy glittering might  
From yonder hoary mountain, Zeus' brow,  
Whose cloven crags parted to give thee light.  
Thou teachest us, wise virgin; as through caves,  
Sad and tear-dropping, steal thy sobbing waves,  
Then flash to day; so virtue's weeping night  
Shall surely break into the dawn's delight.

Emblem, thou, of maiden's love,  
Buried deep in modest heart;  
Growing there to secret strength,  
Hiding, swelling, till at length  
Its Lord's caresses bid it start  
To life and joy! Then forth it springs,  
Circling glad in radiant rings;  
Bliss and fruitfulness it brings.  
Naiad bright, so deckest thou  
With wedding wreaths thy shining brow,  
Trailing ever verdant bands  
Of fern and lily; as the lands  
Thou weddest with thy close embrace,  
In thy laughing, seaward race.

Or dost thou tell us of a sterner theme?

How souls of heroes, like thy forceful stream,  
Are bred and nursed in silence and the night.

Fed from the rills of secret prayer; their might  
Recruited in grim strife with foes concealed;

Until, in fearful hour, the earthquake shock,  
Of war, or civic crisis, cleave the rock.

Then, startling foe and friend, they move revealed  
In beauty terrible, as pure as strong;

But seek the ocean of eternity  
(Too soon, alas!) to which their names belong.

Oh, flood! though earth-born, thou dost seek the sky,  
And this is thy prime lesson: On our tomb

Our resurrection waits; our souls shall fly  
To heaven's sunlight from its blackest gloom.

This is the highest, this the noblest hope,  
To publish which thy secret caverns ope.



## THE DEATH OF MOSES.<sup>1</sup>

The sun stood flaming o'er the western deep,  
 Dyeing its troops of clouds and purple plaiu  
 With red and gold; while up the lower steep  
 Of Nebo, stole the slanting shade, to gain  
 His naked brow. Then came there up to meet  
 The evening rays a reverend man, with step  
 Sedate, but grand; and steadfast eyes<sup>1</sup> which greet  
 The opposing sun, mournful, yet strong to face  
 His fiercest beams. His locks and beard are white  
 As Hermon's crest, which props the northward sky;  
 Yet limb and feature move instinct with might  
 Of manhood, and the soul that doth not die.  
 On topmost height - he pauses, pedestal meet  
 For Israel's Prophet King, the goodliest man  
 Earth ever saw, since Adam from his seat  
 Reviewed his Paradise. Thus, he to scan  
 The scene stood long, then spake:—

"The heritage

To Abram pledged<sup>3</sup> I see: Oh goodly land,  
 To which our Patriarchs turned from age to age  
 With longing faith, to which my guiding hand  
 Hath led the tribes, as sires<sup>4</sup> their infant charge.  
 For forty weary years, through burning sands.  
 Thy face how grand, thy boundaries how large!  
 Not like those pastures where we wore the bonds  
 Of our disgrace, parched with torrid heats,  
 Or drenched<sup>5</sup> with turbid floods. But thou dost drink<sup>6</sup>  
 From crystal founts that hold their airy seats  
 In Heaven, fed from old ocean's farthest brink.  
 Thy features how harmonious, yet sublime!  
 Northward a wall of green, whose summits pierce  
 The lofty heavens, I see; but ere they climb  
 Into the clouds, put on a robe diverse.  
 Can 'earth-horn things assume a garb so pure?  
 How do black scar, and tawny peak outvie  
 The fairest tints of cloudland, yet endure,  
 Unmoved amid their change, the while the sky  
 Doth kiss the earth! 'Tis Hermon clad<sup>7</sup> in snow,  
 Celestial raiment, woven of frozen dew,

---

1—Appeared in *Union Seminary Magazine*

1 Duet. 34:7. 2 Duet. 3:27. 3 Gen. 17:8. 4 Duet. 1:31. 5 Duet. 11:10

6 Duet. 11:11. 7 Jer. 18:14.

(A sight which sweltering Egypt could not know)  
 In awful beauty, here mine eye doth view.  
 The Giant preacheth to thee, Oh, my soul!  
 Thus must God's robe of heavenly righteousness.  
 Blood-washed, thine earthly soil of sin enroll,  
 Ere thou can'st soar and meet the skies in peace.  
 This side the mighty ramparts' foot, behold  
 The upper lake, mid its encircling hills,  
 Gleams like a mirror, which enameled gold  
 Binds with its rim. Here Jordan lights  
 His verdant vale with many a sinuous coil.  
 Beyond, hills rise and fertile valleys spread  
 And plains expand, teeming<sup>1</sup> with wine and oil  
 And plenteous corn; whose glittering streams are fed  
 From springs perennial, mounts like billowy waves  
 Which winter's breath congealed e'en as they rose,  
 I see; within whose veins and darkling caves  
 Lie riches, matching what their fields enclose,  
 Iron and ruddy brass.<sup>2</sup> Here, at my feet,  
 Sheer down two thousand cubits, sullen sleeps  
 The lake of doom, (hemmed in by borders meet  
 Of savage crags and thunder riven heaps)  
 Above the *accursed* cities of the plain.  
 Beyond those ridges spreads an azure band,  
 Which shows us where old ocean doth restrain  
 The western margin of the utmost land.  
 Here is thy home, Oh Israel! here thy rest.  
 In these green vales thy dwelling thou shalt plant.  
 And on these swelling hills thy God hath blest,  
 Here shalt thou guard the holy covenant  
 I gave you, taught by future line of seers;  
 While peace shall multiply thy teeming seed  
 To fill the land, until the promised years  
 Of Shiloh<sup>3</sup> come; whose hand divine shall lead  
 Your hosts, and wield at once my kingly rod,  
 The Prophets crook, and Aaron's censer lit  
 With heavenly flame; and shed that awful blood  
 (Which meaner streams where e'er our altars sit,  
 Dimly foreshadow,) that shall cleanse the world.  
 From yonder hills, with Israel's temple crowned,  
 Messiah's flag of peace shall be unfurled,  
 While earth's remotest nations gather round  
 To catch his gospel light, and learn<sup>4</sup> his ways.  
 The Sun of Righteousness shall, on that hill,  
 Hold his fixed zenith, and from thence his rays  
 With light and holiness and peace shall fill  
 All gentile lands, the foul and bloody seat

---

1 Duet. 11:14-9.    2 Duet. 8:9.    3 Gen. 49:10.    4 Isaiah 2:2-3. Isa. 62:10.

Of the usurper Satan. Israel's race,  
 Nation of Priests<sup>5</sup> shall lead their willing feet  
 And cleansed hearts to seek Jehovah's face.  
 All lands<sup>6</sup> shall Canaan's be, and this our home  
 Again the Paradise of God. But I,  
 Such his decree? I must not hope to come  
 To that good land; but look, and long, and die!  
 Would it were mine (can mortals' hearts suffice  
 To check the wish?) to lead my people still  
 In this, the crisis of their great emprise  
 To prosperous ends, and so my charge fulfil.  
 Across the stream, yon city<sup>1</sup> of the Palms  
 Pollutes its goodly seat with noisome sin.  
 I hear its trumpets blow their loud alarms;  
 Its saucy warriors with defiant din  
 Insult the air, and crowd the hither wall  
 Like moiling ants; the blazonry of hell,  
 Inscribed on streamers, flags, and peunous tall.  
 Likeuess of Molock, Ashtaroth and Belle,  
 And Dagon, Scaly God, affronts the skies,  
 Thrusting incarnate fiends, who personate  
 Murder and brutish lust, blaspheming lies,  
 And rites obscene, into the holy state  
 Of our Jehovah. I, a dying man,  
 Denounce your doom of death. Earth could not bear?  
 The sins of Sodom longer, which out-ran  
 God's longest patience—yours beyond compare  
 Exceed your fathers'. See their ghastly tomb  
 Beneath yon hither waves, whose funeral stroke  
 Measures the tread of your approaching doom.  
 Fain would I live to see those ramparts broke;  
 To head those martial hosts I taught to tame  
 The rage of Sihou and of Bashan's king.  
 Jehovah's<sup>3</sup> banuer, folds of cloud and flame.  
 Should be the topmost sky their terrors fling.  
 My great Lieutenant<sup>4</sup> and my dog<sup>5</sup> of war,  
 Jephunneh's stalwart son, would I unlash.  
 My trumpets' summons, Israel's fierce hurrah.  
 And charge resistless, should these bulwarks dash  
 Like flimsy shreds away; whose wrecks should be  
 Defiled graves forever for God's foes.  
 Or if such monuments must not come to me.  
 In which the joy of battle overflows  
 The hero's spirit, there were calm delights

---

5 Exod. 19:6. 6 Ps 72:11. 7 Duet 3:23-29, Num. 20:8-12.

1 Joshua 6:1. 2 Gen. 18:20, ch. 19:24. 3 Exod. 13:21, Exod. 17:15. 4 Duet. 34:9. 5 Caleb means dog.

For which I yearned. I hoped to see the tribes,  
 Seated in prosperous peace with ordered rights  
 In this good land, where holy priests and scribes,  
 Not Captains stern, should teach the milder ways  
 Of love and faith; and gentle evening Psalms  
 Instead of trumpet's blare should close the days,  
 Swelled by sweet mothers sitting neath their palms,  
 And childrens' voices soft. I thought to share  
 The sacred rapture of that final feast,  
 When all our hosts, purged from stains of war,  
 Shall to the altar come with grateful breast  
 In long procession, while the silvery note  
 Of Levites horns, and choirs of chanting priests  
 Make the high echoes of our anthem float  
 From earth to Heavens own arch; and smoking beasts  
 Of holocaust and incense pure shall raise  
 Their cloudy columns, fragrant with our thanks,  
 To speak to God a ransomed nations praise.  
 When I had led my people's jubilee,  
 Should come my rest, perpetual Sabbath rest,  
 With brain and heart, and weary members free  
 From those hard toils which had my life oppressed.  
 The king<sup>1</sup> in Jeshurun no more, but only one  
 Among my equal brethren, should I dwell  
 In my own modest home, my like-work done;  
 And to my children's children daily tell  
 God's works and laws; until, as yonder sun,  
 Whose nether limb e'en now doth touch the deep,  
 His tollsome race of power and splendor run,  
 Sinks in his azure bed to quiet sleep  
 Amid serenest lights; thus should I seek  
 The grave, my couch of calm and glorious rest.  
 But why this earth-born wish, as vain as weak!  
 Against that fixed decree, that stern arrest  
 Of hope and life? I must not cross this flood,  
 Nor share those joys, debarred by my offense,  
 Once small appearing; till thy chastening rod,  
 Oh Father, taught me, and the clearer sense  
 My conscience gains from heaven's approaching light.  
 I bow my guilty head; for thou hadst placed  
 My state so high, no trespass could be slight  
 Which I might work, nor folly, which disgraced  
 Thy power, deputed to my creature hand.  
 Just is my sentence, black my sin with pride  
 And heat<sup>2</sup> forgetful of thy strict command.  
 So thy sole glory fain would I divide

Betwixt myself and thee. Oh wish profane!  
 As though thy rod of power were mine to wield.  
 Blessed be God! 'tis not a wrathful blow  
 Which smites my sin, hut those soft strokes that yield  
 Medicinal cure: And that hlest stream which flows  
 Along the ages from his smitten rock,<sup>3</sup>  
 Prefigured hy the meaner blood we draw  
 From dying substitutes of herd or flock,  
 Hath washed me white from guilt of broken law.  
 Thou chastening, pitying God, I how to thee  
 In peace supreme, my fond desire recall  
 From earth and time, to find in Heaven and thee  
 My home, my land, my church, my all in all!  
 Now earth, and sea, and sky, and sun, farewell!  
 I look my last, nor would the look renew.  
 A fairer scene than Canaan casts its spell  
 On my enraptured spirit. To my view  
 A purer radiance rises, at whose heams  
 Yon sinking orb looks dull. I see from whence  
 This flood ineffable of glory streams,  
 Not hy corporeal eyes, hut inner sense  
 Of spiritual sight, which to my soul reveals,  
 The Heavenly gates, whiter than Hermon's snow,  
 And loftier than his peaks. And from them peals  
 Celestial harmony, whose accents flow  
 In mingled strains, so soft, so high, so clear,  
 Our Sanctuary's psalms discordant sound.  
 Earth, thou are naught.<sup>1</sup> My ravished heart and ear  
 Forget thy charms. Upon this verdant ground  
 I lay me down, weak with excess of bliss.  
 To drink the glory in with steady gaze.  
 The vision brighter glows. What trance is this,  
 Which thus exhausts my soul with glad amaze?  
 I feel the fanning wings of Cheruhim,  
 I hear their voices whisper: "Brother, come!"  
 Now death<sup>2</sup> thou vanquished foe, lead me to Him  
 Whose bosom is my everlasting home.

Moses dies Satan appears rising from a dark ravine to seize his body, but Michael with a troop of Angels repulses him with majestic and grave rebuke: whereupon his company bear away the corpse to its burial,<sup>4</sup> chanting a hymn to Messiah.

---

3 1 Cor. 10:4.

1 Ps. 73:25-26. 2 Duet. 34:5. 3 Ep. of Jude v. 9. 4 Duet. 34:6.

## THE CHRISTIAN WOMANS DROWNING HYMN.

### A MONODY.

(A Christian lady and organist, went July, 1886, with, and at the request of her sister, for a few days' excursion to Indianola. They arrived the day before the great night storm and tidal wave, which submerged the town. Both the ladies and children, after hours of fearful suspense, were drowned, the house where they sought refuge being broken to pieces in the waves. A survivor stated that the organist spent much of the interval in most moving prayer. Their remains were recovered on the subsidence of the tempest, and interred at their homes, amidst universally solemn and tender sympathy.

The following verses are imagined, as expressing the emotions of the Christian wife, sister and mother, during her long struggle with the waters:)

Sister, awake! Oh list! there is a change;  
The moon, whose flood of light, at eventide  
Made of the placid sea an answering range  
Of star-lit sky, the upper heavens beside;  
Sheds now its fitful gleams through angry rifts.  
The fanning breezes that caressed our locks  
Are swollen to a gale, on which there drifts  
The shriek of drowning men; and sullen shocks  
Of waves, like trampling hosts, assault the ground—  
• Oh hear beneath the hollow, deep sea-moan  
Soh of unrest eternal! where doth sound  
The smothered agony, and parting groan  
Of all the dead that ocean's caverns keep.  
Our hearts, oh! sister, yesterday were hright  
As was the sun-lit surface of the deep;  
Our mirth was like its ripples tipped with light—  
We thought hut in this summer-sea to lave,  
Our members fevered by the dog-star's ray.  
And yet, heneath our laughter's rippling wave  
My spirit heard a moan, which seemed to say  
In tone half-felt, unreasoning; beware!  
Thou art the type, thou beauteous, treacherous sea  
Of mortals' lives, whose sunny joys show fair  
But to prelude the the storm.  
Come, let us flee!  
See these intrusive surges, each more nigh  
Than its audacious fellow! Sister, come!

Too late, thou sayest? 'Ere now the breakers fly,  
 Crowned with crashing wrecks and seething foam,  
 Across that narrow isthmus, where alone  
 Our path to safety lay. Remorseless deep,  
 Thy cunning, faithless work, 'thou hast well done.  
 We are thy helpless prey, which thou wilt keep  
 Fast caught in thine embrace, to wait the death  
 Thy fierce yet stealthy tread will bring. Oh fate  
 So sudden, unforeseen! to end our breath  
 In our strong prime! To set so short a date,  
 One eve, betwixt our joy and our despair!  
 Insidious foe; knewest thou that manly breast,  
 Those nervous, sheltering arms are absent far,  
 Which even thy mighty rage would dare contest  
 For her he loved? Against two women weak,  
 Two frightened babes, inexorable king,  
 Resounds thy diapason dread, the shriek  
 Of wailing beasts, that bear upon their wings  
 The hissing spray, and thunder of thy hosts  
 To drown our puny cry.

So with thy shout,  
 From far-off tropic deeps and Carib-coasts  
 Thy huge reserve of floods thou callest out  
 To overwhelm these helpless lives. Our bruised limbs  
 And garments rent are tossed like leaves that float  
 On autumn blasts; while ever nearer climbs  
 Thy cruel, lapping wave, to clutch our throat.  
 Yea, thou art mighty in thy rage, oh sea!  
 Thou, atheist Titan, wouldst assault the sky  
 And fain wouldst bid the frightened stars to flee  
 From thy vast tumult! But they do not fly!  
 Between the storm-rent clouds I see their beams,  
 Slender but steadfast, and serene as clear,  
 Disdain thy brutal wrath; and with them streams  
 That still, small voice believing spirits hear;  
 Soft, but more potent than thy deaf'ning roar.  
 It is thy Master's voice, insurgent deep,  
 Who sits above those stars, who shuts the door,  
 Or opens to the storm, who bids thee keep  
 Thy subject bounds, and measures all thy flood  
 In his mere palm; when he bids, "Peace; be still;"  
 Thy waves shall crouch like beasts, beneath his rod.  
 Thou tосsest wide thy billows' hands to kill.  
 The everlasting arms enfold and keep  
 My better life; Jehovah, he who guides  
 Yon starry worlds, as shepherds lead their sheep,  
 Inspires my psalm of faith, above the tides  
 Of thy vain tumult, ringing high and clear.

Belov'd on earth, farewell! Oh heavenly spouse  
I come! thy voice doth cast out all my fear  
And charms my soul aloft. Thy will allows  
To the devourer, naught hut this poor clay,  
Earth-born like it. Then, take it, ravenous sea!  
Thy futile spoil; thou hast an empty prey.  
Even this for a day—nor shall it be  
The food of thy sea monsters, nor be drawn  
To thy dark caverns. This my soul foresees,  
Grown prescient in the light of heaven's near dawn.  
Whilst thou shalt cower at my Lord's decrees  
Back to thy kennels, this poor frame shall lie  
Embalmed in loving tears, and take its rest  
Beneath the flowers and sheltering groves, hard by  
The peaceful homes of men; and temples blest  
Of Christ; until his resurrection-morn  
And that new world, when "Seas shall be no more."  
Thus, from thy stormiest crest, with holy scorn,  
I mount to peaceful mansions, where thy roar  
No more shall reach, than to yon starry orbs.



### A SONNET TO LEE.

Israel one David, Athens one Pericles,  
Thebes one Epaminondas could produce.  
Thy State, O, Lee, of greatness more profuse,  
Nurtured two Washingtons upon her knees;  
The first to crown on earth his God did please;  
But thy reward was set thee in the skies.  
Stern thy fate than Jackson's; him to rise  
And feel no fall, appointed Heaven's decrees.  
From thy high noon thou turnedst to the west,  
By clouds infolded, thunderous and dark,  
Which yet, reluctant, spread around thy rest,  
Purple and golden glories, prescient mark  
Of that eternal radiance which hath blest  
Thy soul, beyond our sun's inferior arc.

## GENERAL T. J. JACKSON.

AN ELEGY, 1887.

Six days our hearts stood still with keen suspense;  
Our champion lay sore smitten of God's hand.  
The seventh, our hope was slain, for he was dead!  
Our prayers were vain; and now our palsied sense  
Knows not our grief to utter. Weep, O land!  
Who shall inspire thy threnody, and wed  
Thy walls to numbers mournful as thy breast?  
Invoke no pagan Muse, whose fabled sigh  
And painted tear but mimic woe sincere.  
Come rather, thou, the Spirit who dost rest  
In truth's eternal seat; it was thine eye  
Illumined him we mourn; and thy pure fear  
His greatness was. Thee then, we call to teach  
Our pain fit voice, who didst thy seer's lament  
Attune to chant meet dirge for Zion's fall.  
"Oh that our heads were waters!" Then might reach  
Our floods of tears to the full argument  
Of our calamity, as we recall,  
In contrast black, our hero's glorious morn  
With this drear night that clouds it at midday.  
But twice twelve moons before, Virginia said:  
"Hither my sons to meet the invaders' scorn!  
They deem we withered in obscure decay,  
My bosom dry of that proud milk that fed  
My Washingtons and Henrys. O'er my head  
They shake the loathed scourge, as though to sway  
To slavery this soul to freedom born."  
Then of her myriads, rallying to her cry,  
Our mother's instinct owned him foremost son,  
Modest as prompt, with spirit trained to might  
In secret prayer, with Bayard's chivalry  
Of faith begotten; with a valor won  
From God's own strength and truth's serenest light.  
She gave her banner to his stainless hand.  
Thence, like the day-star blazed he in her front;  
His sweep, the wind's, his stroke the knell of fate  
To them who durst pollute her sacred land.  
Onward and upward, through the war-cloud's brunt,  
He soared with steady wing, as though to' instate

Her flag in freedom's peaceful citadel.  
Then, midst his loftiest flight, our eagle fell!  
That we were fall'n with him we learned too late.  
Yea, bow, O Lee, in grief that kingly front  
To which all others hent; and weep thou drops  
Such as were shed by Israel's warrior king,  
For Jonathan and Saul the highly slain.  
For now from thy right side disaster lops  
The arm which wont thy victories to bring;  
And could thy grandest purposes explain  
In grander deeds. Yea, weep thou hoary chief!  
For with his parting soul success hath flown,  
To come no more. Not that thy worth is less,  
Or patriot-will to win thy land relief;  
Nor all thy heroes with their pattern gone.  
Still shall ye toil and die; hut full success  
No more shall crown these toils, stanch as his own.  
Still shall your gallant struggles honor save,  
Losing all else. And weep, ye rugged hosts,  
Who laughed in battle's dead-lock: He is gone  
Whose shout worth fresh battalions: "On ye brave!"  
Inspired your charge. Weep too, ye martial ghosts,  
Who, parting from your bleeding flesh, were glad  
That he still battles to avenge your fall.  
For none remain that vengeance to demand,  
Until the heavenly court's decree he had.  
But chiefest thou, Virginia, round thee call  
Thy mourning women; drape thy widowed land  
In blackest weeds, and let thy eyes be wells  
Of bitter waters. Yea, and thou didst mourn!  
Twice didst thou bury him; thy maids with flowers,  
Thy elders with his mother-earth. Thy bells  
With dismal stroke and cannons' hellowing groan  
Measured thy funeral step, as all thy powers  
Unrolled their gloomy ranks.  
But hadst thou seen with his presaging eye,  
How much was lost with him; hadst broke the seal  
Of fate for thy succeeding years, and read  
As he had read, that thy best sons should die,  
Yet win no rescue for the commonweal  
By their rich blood, as vain, as freely shed:  
How conquerors, ruthless in their pride of power,  
Should trample thy fair neck, whose queenly foot  
Found rightful place upon the oppressor's head;  
Cunning and malice rule the dismal hour  
Of thine eclipse, and fraud and force uproot  
Each right implanted by thy fathers dead:  
How doltish serfs and alien thieves should foul

Thy seats of power, once by thy sages graced;  
While all thy noblest, fairest, wisest sank  
In want obscure, hounded by slanderous howl:  
And worst, how some, thy sons, whom thou hadst placed  
'Neath thy free banner, in the honored rank  
Of thy defenders, wooed by filthy greed,  
Should aid, Oh shame! their mother's chais to draw:  
Hadst thou seen this as thy dead champion saw;  
(And that it might not be was fain to bleed)  
Then hadst thou wept, not tears of brine, but blood!  
Yea, woeful mother, weep! There is no herb,  
Euphrasy, rue, nor balsam, that can buy  
Health for thy deadly hurt; this saw thy Lee:  
Hence in the battle's edge the end superb  
Of those who for, and with their country die,  
He sought, but could not find; thus God's decree,  
So as he must not fall, nor could endure  
To see the glories bought with fathers' blood  
So foully ravaged, lost beyond recall,  
His mighty heart-strings brake, his spirit pure  
Went up where wrongs no more oppress the good.  
Lift up thy wail, Virginia; thy stone wall  
Thy tower of strength is prostrate. Mothers, weep;  
Who for your country gave your bodies' fruit,  
Dearer than life; yet willing their dear blood  
Should buy her dearer freedom. Widows, weep:  
And ye, unwedded maidens, wan and mute,  
(Filt mates for heroes) who for country's good  
Could nuptial joys forego, and think her weal  
Full recompense for all your widowed lives:  
For HE IS DEAD: your priceless price is spent,  
And no deliverance bought. Ah! harshest deal  
Of sightless fortune! this the thought that rives  
Your aching hearts. Oh God, why hast thou sent  
Such mockery of hope? Why bid arise  
Such champion of our cause, and let him bring  
The boon so near our grasp, and then withdraw  
Thy gift, his work unfinished, to thy skies?  
Forgive the faithless question, Sovereign King.  
We read its answer with repentant awe,  
In our own sin. He was thine overture;  
Thy merciful proposal to us, writ  
In characters more clear than prophet's word,  
And more divine, in life and deed too pure  
For earth-born virtue; such as could befit  
No source but Heaven. And by his righteous sword,  
Great rescue and defense didst thou bestow,  
Plucked from the jaws of death and peril dread

Not once, but oft; wherein this meaning shone:  
 "Would ye be free and great? Your giant foe  
 Would ye o'erthrow, and crush his ravenous head?  
 Be what your Joshua is: as he hath done  
 Do ye. Like unto his, be all your ends  
 Your God's, your country's and the truth's: your ease  
 Denied for duty, and your valor taught  
 Of my true fear. This way your God commends:  
 Will ye walk in it to a glorious peace?  
 Fair overture and true! The State inwrought  
 With this man's virtues, all her sons like him,  
 Had been unconquerable, absolute,  
 Achilles of the nations, panoplied  
 Not by the baptism of the infernal stream,  
 Lucre and cunning and the strength of brute  
 Conferring; but with holy power supplied  
 From that clear flood, that watereth the street  
 Of God's eternal city' impregnable.  
 So ours, fenced by this righteousness, had stood  
 'Gainst Satan's world. On what wise did we meet  
 God's overture? Our purpose mutable  
 Postponed His call: we fain would have the good  
 And yet neglect its source; would seize the crown,  
 Yet slight the appointed race. So sluggish peace  
 And hope deceitful lure the thoughtless brood  
 Not worth the prize; who draw the angry frown  
 Of God, and His avenging hand release.  
 But thus not all. Thus spake the goodlier host:  
 "Yea Lord, we will be free, and on thy terms!"  
 And these God's model followed where he went,  
 To bloody graves; or else, to mourn their lost  
 And chant their dirge, remain. Our sin confirms  
 The just decree. "Thy visitation sent  
 In mercy's chosen day thou knewest not  
 O land! But in thy wealth hebetate and gross,  
 Thou wouldest not read aright God's offered gift."  
 That question solved, before disaster blot  
 The scutcheon of God's knight, or honor's loss;  
 Up to his rest doth he his servant lift:  
 His task is done; the woe he must not feel.  
 Boast not upon his fall, ye haughty foes:  
 Ye slew him not. Your stores no missile beld  
 To touch that sacred life. No bolt, nor steel  
 Forged for your greed or malice could unclove  
 The links of heavenly mail the truth did weld  
 Across that breast. The intent was yours, and guilt:  
 But impotent as foul. God's was the deed.  
 Wherefore, as instruments He chose the friends

Who for this life would joyfully have spilt  
 Their dearest blood; unwitting as the steed  
 Which bore him, or the lightning's bolt which rends  
 The clouds to minister Jehovah's will.  
 For not of wrath, but love the stroke was pledge,  
 It took God's favorite from the coming doom,  
 Whose baleful shade, than Arctic night more chill,  
 On his prophetic soul now cast its edge,  
 Prognostic of the blacker, coming gloom  
 Of freedom lost. Thereat his swelling soul,  
 Spurning the shameful bonds with grand disdain,  
 Burst from the fetters of his earthly frame,  
 And soared forever free. Asunder roll  
 The' eternal gates; while from their glittering fane  
 The spirits troop, his brotherhood to claim,  
 Who free from chains of bondage lived, or died.  
 But we, alas! unworthy of his fate,  
 Live on to wear the chain, and watch his dust  
 By venal and contemptuous tongues belied;  
 Of manhood scarce retaining such poor state  
 As dares to guard aright our funeral trust.  
 For on the soil baptized by his blood,  
 His comrades raise no monumental stone  
 To make his name endure. The lowly grave,  
 That keeps what earth reserves of him, had stood  
 Unmarked, but that a weeping woman, lone  
 And widowed, still than hearted men more brave,  
 Planted her modest shaft; and maiden's hands  
 Weekly bedeck his sod with wreathed flowers,  
 Soon withered, like the cause he loved so well.  
 Thus lowly lie, in this dishonored land  
 Valor and truth and those imperial powers  
 Of genius consecrate (in Heaven they dwell  
 In state supernal!) while the sordid dust  
 Of coarse oppressors, great hut in their crime,  
 Greedy of gold and blood, their people's shame,  
 Usurps the honor sacred to the just,  
 And flouts the heavens with haggart shaft sublime;  
 While mercenary mobs resound their name,  
 And fawning priests, worst traitors to Christ's word,  
 Teach them to cry: "Success, thou art divine!"  
 "Be thou our God, for thou dost eat our lust."  
 Thou sittest judge of all, O righteous Lord!  
 Thou wilt arise and let Thy judgments shine,  
 And they shall clear the memories of the just.  
 Our grievance we revoke; thou, mighty shade,  
 Lackest no mausoleum, while true hearts,  
 And such there are, enshrine thy memory.  
 These nobler temples of thy fame, not made

By earthly hands, nor graven by men's arts,  
Shall keep thy glory! And these mountains free,  
Eternal watchmen round thy modest tomb,  
They are fit sentinels; their soaring peaks  
Point to the skies which thou inhabitest:  
Steadfast like thee, whether the winter's gloom  
Change them to iron, or Aurora's streaks  
Emblazon them like mansions of the blest;  
Or glittering snows enwrap their giant forms,  
White as thy heavenly robe, so earth meets sky,  
And mortal ken can scarce discern their bound;  
These keep their faithful ward through calms and storms  
Nor cease to speak thy name, till time shall die  
And thy great Captain's final trumpet sound.

## ANNIHILATION.

They boast that "death is an eternal sleep,"

Where, if no morning e'er restores delight,  
At least, no mourner ever wakes to weep—

The simile is false; the endless night  
That has no dawn, brings not the soul to rest;  
But to despair: For he who rests awakes  
To conscious ease that satisfies his quest  
For recompense of pain—The life that makes  
A woeful ending is a woeful life.

He is the victor who retains the field  
When battle ends: And thus the closing strife  
Of earth-born anguish, if the future yield

No compensation, must forever cast  
Its blackness backward on the wretch's fate.

Let nature speak, whose craving, deep and vast

Yearns for existence, be our conscious state  
Or sweet or bitter; like the seeing eye

Insatiable of light, or ear of sound,  
Desire instinct, inwrought of God most high

Not rule of interest astutely found  
By after calculation, as is taught

Of our first father's sleep in Paradise  
His drowsed sense, untroubled, though he thought,

He then to nothing whence he took his rise

Was lapsing swift. It is the voice divine  
Speaking within us, which instructs our wish  
For endless being. Else why is it mine

Unlike the unreasoning bird or beast or fish,  
To recollect the past; to anticipate;

To fear the future woe; to hope the good?

Accursed was the gift of prescient thought  
That raised our empty pride above the brood  
Of brutish things; for it a lie hath taught.

The hind can crop the herb and course the lawn,  
Or drink the mountain spring with thoughtless glee,  
Untroubled by the hour her dying fawn

Cost her a transient pang; nor doth foresee  
The hunter's coming shaft that seeks her breast,

No memory brings past sorrows, no foresight

Arrays its future terrors to molest

Her present joy: One sudden thrill of fright,



One stroke, one death-throe ends the whole career,  
Simple and brief, but rounded in its joy.

Why should I die like her if I must fear,  
Remember, hope, desire, doomed to employ  
My noblest powers of being to pursue  
Futility? Why mine to stretch the thought  
To progress onward, and the endless view  
Of growth of soul with larger glories fraught,  
In widening vistas mounting through the realms  
Of knowledge boundless? Why when present love

With its alluring bliss the heart o'erwhelms,  
Is it ordained our foresight still must rove  
To future days, that love might fill like this  
With equal joys, yet know it must not be?

Why is it reason will not, cannot cease  
To frame that thought supreme, eternity;

Capacious of infinitude of good,  
Mocking the soul with cravings infinite,  
If life must be the span the bestial brood  
Enjoys? Abhorred span! that art but meet  
To shew us Being's woes, and then its loss  
Irreparable. Cursed be the boon

Of such existence, cheating with its dross  
The golden hopes it sanctioneth, as soon  
As they begin to glow—The better lot

Is given the brute, who drinks the trivial cup  
Of life, and ends, forgetting and forgot.

If death ends all, a blacker thought looms up:  
Then all we love must perish when they die;

We part forever, and the love that blest  
Our hearts remains a wound that shall not dry  
Its bitter stream till Nothingness arrest

Our woe and being by one common blow.  
Love is immortal: all things else may die;

The forest kings decay, the ceaseless flow  
Of ancient rivers, proudly sweeping by

Long buried cities, wane, the steadfast heads  
Of everlasting mountains waste and stoop,

The hoary seas desert their sunless beds;  
This ordered frame may backward droop

To endless chaos—But the eye  
That shines with love's self-sacrificing light  
Outlasts the beams which from Arcturus fly,  
Orion or Bootes: it is bright

With God's own rays. He is the sun of love  
And they the orbs that round the centre roll

Reflecting him, as they forever move  
In circles shaped by his supreme control,

He is eternal; so the gift divine!

Is all we love then, mortal? Do the fires  
 Of genius, kindled from the heavenly shrine  
 Of truth and beauty, perish, as expires  
 The gilded butterfly or tinted rose?  
 Or shall the Sage's vision, that can pierce  
 Through Nature's secrets, make the sea disclose  
 His deep abyss, and ride his billows fierce,  
 Can map the planet's pathway and foretell  
 Their sure returns, can bridge the flood;  
 That can the storm-cloud's subtle bolt expel,  
 "Can look from nature up to nature's God,"  
 And in his works can read his deeper thought;  
 Be quenched in darkness like the rotting eye  
 Of newt or toad? The heroism that wrought  
 A nation's disenfranchisement, fain to die  
 For country's weal, and seek no recompense  
 But conscious right, the martyr's steadfast faith  
 Which joys to die for Truth, and own no sense  
 Of fiery torments: mother's love, which hath  
 No thought of self, consummate effluence  
 Of heaven's own virtue; perish evermore  
 As utterly as hypocrites' pretense,  
 Or as the bubbles hursting on the shore,  
 Or as the glitter of the serpent's scales  
 Decaying back to dust? 'Tis blasphemy!  
 Bethink ye; If this creed of death prevails  
 To doom our spirits to mortality,  
 It leaves no trace of God on nature's page—  
 If man is soulless, then an athelst world  
 Is all he knows, where senseless forces rage  
 In fire, and sea, and storm, and suns are hurled  
 With troops of waiting stars, by aimless might,  
 Through voids immense, and blind mechanic fate  
 Inexorable, on its throne of night,  
 Sightless and pitiless maintain its state  
 In earth or heaven there is no ear to hear  
 The sufferer's prayer; no heart to feel his woe;  
 No hand to shield the gust, or to repair  
 The foulest wrong that ruthless force can do?—  
 So right eternal perishes, and crime  
 Endures eternal, scorning all repeal.—  
 Then are this lower earth these heavens sublime  
 One vast machine, 'neath whose remorseless wheel  
 The corn is human hearts, instinct of pain,  
 And joy, and hope, and fear, that writhe and bleed,  
 Till ground to nothingness. Oh piteous grain!  
 Oh dreadful engine! Monster! that dost feed  
 Thine endless grind with countless precious lives!

Is such a world our home? 'Tis dark as bell!  
 Its joys but mock us, since no joy survives;  
 But death and loss irreparable dwell  
 Perpetual masters. Yet, one other fate  
 There is more black—the eternal recompense  
 Which conscious guilt forewarns it, may await  
 The soul which cannot die, nor find defense  
 Against the Judge changeless, omnipotent—  
 Ah! this the thought which drives the coward heart  
 The desperate alternative to choose  
 'Twixt hell and nothingness—A better part  
 Appears to faith—Then why, Oh mortals, lose  
 That nobler choice, Redemption? bought with blood  
 Of God incarnate, wrought by power divine,  
 The safe inheritance of perfect good.  
 The grace that shall your inmost souls refine  
 From error, sin and sorrow, and bestow  
 The angels' life of bliss and purity,  
 Whose years are measured only by the flow  
 Of God's eternity: The gift as free  
 To every thirsting soul as air of heaven!  
 Why do men turn from glories such as these  
 To dreary night and death? and still elect  
 Infinite loss and naught o'er boundless seas  
 Of joy? Because, O shame! Their guilty fears detect  
 The treason and the folly they have wrought  
 Against themselves and their best destiny  
 In serving sin! This infamy hath taught  
 (And this alone) the atheist's grovelling plea,  
 That death may be to them "eternal sleep."

## THE TEXAS BRIGADE AT THE WILDERNESS.

(Written May, 1890.)

It was upon the sixth of May, five miles from Lee away,  
Our corps amid the forest lay, before the break of day.  
Our limbs by the hard march distressed, close to the ground we  
pressed,  
As by forgetful slumber blest, we took our dreamless rest.  
Tho' now and then the cannon's boom disturbed the silent gloom;  
Our ears, locked up as in the silent tomb, gave to the sound small  
room;  
But what is this bids sleep depart; and makes each soldier start,  
The hot blood throbbing at his heart, with sense and mind alert?  
The long roll beat! "Fall in!" they cry; "Fall in, the minutes fly!"  
For these five miles we must pass by our succor to supply.  
The teeming foes our friends confront, whose weary swords are  
blunt  
So we are needed at the front to bear the battle's brunt.  
Our rest was short; our food was none; but our fatigue was gone;  
Our leader calls and we press on, as eager racers run.  
The stars above, so calm and bright, shed down their solemn light  
Through forest leaves with dews bedight. Over the waning night  
Aurora spreads her rosy fire. The timid birds aspire  
To tune their thankful, morning choir. But hark! the contrast dire,  
The cannon's roar and sulphurous flash, and bloody weapons clash;  
The thud of trampling, panting steeds, the wounded wretch who  
bleeds,  
Bewailing pangs which no one heeds, amidst all deadly deeds!  
And now the sun confronts our eyes, lurid with battles' dyes;  
Beneath, the tangled forest lies, whence fumes of topbet rise.  
Thereat we strain our throats anew, we pierce the tumult through;  
Alas! the sight that meets our view: who stand and fight are few.  
From broken ranks the many flee. But, courage! Yonder, see.  
Upon the battle's edge is Lee! The god of war is he!  
Serene, elate, with steadfast will, he bids the storm be still.  
He plants his heroes on the hill, the deadly breach to fill.  
We lead our march; to us he turns. That heart, each man discerns,  
Big as a world, with pity yearns, and yet with valor burns  
Sterner than death and fate.

"Ye Texas men whom Hood has led,  
Who for our land so oft have bled,  
But from the foe have never fled;

Now is your time to fight!

"This hour decides your country's weal;  
Quick! into line of battle wheel.  
And give the enemy cold steel;  
And God defend the right."

What answer gave the fierce hurrah that rent the lowering sky?  
Our purpose grim, our fiery will, resolved to do or die.  
But well we understood the task, now set for us to do.  
Our corps was near, its ranks were full, its men were staunch and true;

But time must lapse before the mass is formed in due array;  
And to our foes what vantage ground may not this space betray?  
It is our blood that must redeem this time, and so give pause  
Till ampler food be ready made to fill this Moloch's jaws.  
"Forward, the First Brigade!" cries Gregg, but not alone leads he;  
For lo! beside him at the front, the towering form of Lee.  
Where he sends us he too will go. A crisis worth our blood  
He sees; his own more precious drops must join our cheaper flood.  
He bares his head; the sunbeams stain his hoary locks with fire;  
He speaks no word, but look and mien sublime all hearts inspire,  
Then from the grizzly soldiers' eyes who wont in battle's throes  
To laugh, and mock at peril's dread, the briny flood o'erflows.  
Not coward-tears are these, but such as come from martyr's eyes;  
Who for Christ's truth, and heavenly joys, the stake and fire despise.  
Ye proud invaders, well may ye these weeping foemen fear;  
A thousand drops from next your heart, shall pay each generous tear.  
For hear their word: "For that old man we'll charge the gates of  
hell!

Nor shall he share the deadly risk!" for he is loved too well.  
Let lives the cause can better spare make up the holocaust.  
Here then we halt, till he retire to his more proper post.  
At last he yields. Now shall he see, how we will do our parts.  
"Forward again!" with traile'd arms each man impetuous starts,  
Like hounds unleashed that seek the game, we pierce the smoking  
wood.

Five to our one, in leafy screens ambushed, the foemen stood.  
"One volley, boys, low, in the breast; then to the bayonet!"  
As through the tangled brush we tore, a second line we met,  
And now a third, replacing those that fled before our blows,  
And worse; their overlapping wings our right and left enclose;  
With fire in front, and fire in flank, our thin lines melt away.  
Our charge must pause; we are too few! But here at least to stay!  
And we will die so hard and slow, that Lee the time shall save  
He needs, to form his battle lines—so shot for shot we gave,  
And death for death at closest range; till half the hour was spent.  
At last! thank God! at last 'tis done. Hark to that shout which rent  
The very heavens! Hurrah! They come, Longstreet and Anderson.

Earth shakes beneath their myriad feet! Hurrah! The day is won!  
Two miles ahreast, an alavanache of fire and steel they rush;  
And rank on rank in fragments break, as ocean billows crush  
The rotten barques; and drive the shreds, as chaff before the storm.  
Six hundred men and seventy-two there were that morn, to form  
The sturdy remnant of the lines, at first three thousand strong.  
Four hundred now and fifty lay the bloody trail along,  
Bleeding or dead. How far we kept our pledge these numbers tell.  
Ghosts of our comrades dead, know this: Ye were avenged well,  
If streams of meaner blood could pay for each rich drop of yours.  
All honor to our gallant Gregg! As yet the heavenly powers  
Bore him unscathed in danger's front. All honor to our slain,  
Who gave their all for country's sake; their names shall live again  
While we can sing their deathless deeds. All honor to the chief  
Who fain would spend his blood with ours, to huy our land relief.